DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 162 SP 035 588

AUTHOR Terry, Paul M.
TITLE Arkansas Principals' Attitudes Concerning the Program for Effective Teaching Model (Hunter Model).
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 123p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Responsibility; *Clinical Supervision (of Teachers); Comparative Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Models; *Principals; *Program Attitudes; *Supervisory Training; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Arkansas; Hunter (Madeline); *Program for Effective Teaching

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to compare the attitudes of Arkansas elementary and secondary school principals toward the Madeline Hunter clinical supervision model "Program for Effective Teaching (PET)." A survey instrument titled "Attitudes of Principals Toward PET" was mailed to every elementary and secondary public school principal (1,067) in the state. Respondents (N=459) provided demographic data including the number of PET training cycles each had completed. The survey instrument measured the subskills of attitude, quality, enhance, and coaching. Attitude measured the general attitudes of principals toward the PET program; quality measured principals' attitudes as to how well their PET training was conducted; enhance measured the principals' perceived enhancement of their supervisory skills; and coach focused on the principals' PET maintenance skills as well as maintenance of the PET program in their school buildings. According to the data analysis, there was a significant difference between the elementary and secondary principals' attitudes toward the PET model. Recommendations were made for further study with secondary principals concerning their need for enhancement of coaching skills. Copies of the survey instrument and various items of correspondence are appended. (Contains 44 references.) (Author/LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 162

ARKANSAS PRINCIPALS' ATTITUDES CONCERNING THE PROGRAM FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING MODEL (HUNTER MODEL)

A STUDY CONDUCTED BY

PAUL M. TERRY

IN COOPERATION WITH THE

ARKANSAS SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

SPRING 1993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Terry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP035588

ARKANSAS PRINCIPALS' ATTITUDES CONCERNING THE PROGRAM FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING MODEL (HUNTER MODEL)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to compare the attitudes of Arkansas elementary and secondary school principals toward the Madeline Hunter clinical supervision model Program for Effective Teaching.

The study was a replication of a similar study conducted by Dr. Alice S. Sheehan of South Carolina. The survey instrumentation for the study was adapted from Dr. Sheehan's original instrument, Attitudes of Principals toward PET. The survey instrument measured the subskills of Attitude, Quality, Enhance, and Coaching. Attitude measured the general attitudes of principals toward the PET program, Quality measured principals' attitudes as to how well their PET training was conducted, Enhance measured the principals' perceived enhancement of their supervisory skills, and Coach focused on the principals' PET maintenance skills as well as maintenance of the PET program in their school building.

Surveys were mailed to every elementary and secondary public school principal (1067) in the state. Four-hundred and fifty-nine responded for a return of forty-three percent.

Descriptive statistics provided data concerning gender, ethnicity, age, highest earned degree, years in education, type of school, and the number of PET training cycles each principal had completed. The one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used for the inferential statistics. In addition, the survey instrument was designed to acquire a values rating on the subcomponents of the Total Teaching Act., the Instructional Skills, and the PET

1

training. Principals were requested to rate each subcomponent from no value to very valuable to teachers.

The results of the analysis of the data suggest there was a significant difference between the elementary and secondary principals' attitudes toward the Program for Effective Teaching model. Recommendations were made for further study with secondary principals concerning their need for enhancement of coaching skills.

INTRODUCTION

What works to make teachers more effective? In Arkansas, the answer appears to be the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) model. During the late 1970's Arkansas educators were faced with various aspects of school reform such as more emphasis on teacher accountability, excellence in academics, higher educational standards, and mastery of basic skills. Seeking an answer to meet these challenges of school reform, Arkansas implemented a state-adopted staff development model–the Arkansas Program for Effective Teaching.

The primary objective of the PET model is to increase learning for students in a more effective, efficient, and relevant manner. PET has been defined as:

> . . .a research based staff development program which teaches teachers the essential elements of any lesson, how to analyze his/her teaching behavior in terms of these elements, and how to continually make needed improvements or adjustments so that all students can learn more effectively and efficiently (Etheridge, 1978, p. 2).

The primary premise of PET is to recognize the interests, style, needs, and individuality of the classroom teacher with techniques and tools to use in planning for effective instruction as the teacher utilizes his/her own style during instruction. PET is the science of teaching, while the teacher's style is the art of teaching.

Once the teacher has completed the PET training, it is the responsibility of the building principal to implement a framework for clinical

supervision of the teachers. In essence, the principal becomes a coach to the teacher and works with the teacher on making professional judgments concerning their teaching activities. The principal's attitude toward the PET training they received, and how to coach the teacher in the various components of PET is of tantamount importance to successful implementation of the PET model in their building.

The study will establish the attitudes of Arkansas elementary and secondary principals toward the various components of the Program for Effective Teaching model.

Statement of the Problem

Cubberley (1922) said, "As is the principal, so is the school." (p. 190). Some seventy years later this short phrase is still a valid statement. The principal sets the tone, mood, and attitude for the climate of the school. It could also be said that a school is only as effective as its leader. Sergiovanni (1987) contends that climate is a form of organizational energy whose telling effects on the school depend on how this energy is channeled and directed. The principal or supervisor can play key roles in directing climate energy into productive and effective channels.

Edmonds (1981) maintains there are two main correlates of an effective school which include the leadership of the principal or supervisor characterized by substantial attention to the quality of instruction, and by the school having a pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus.

One of the major concerns of the effective schools movement is the effectiveness of the teacher in the classroom. But, of even more concern is the effectiveness of the principal or supervisor who is responsible for the appraisal of the teacher's effectiveness or performance.

Sergiovanni (1987) asserts that

> . . .successful leadership and administration within the principalship is directed toward the improvement of teaching and learning for students. One rarely finds an effective school without an effective principal (p. 7).

Accountability has increasingly become an important factor in education. The issue of accountability has caused educators to carefully review the procedures for determining teacher effectiveness which affects student achievement. Madeline Hunter (1973) contends that she developed a model for effective teaching that provides for accountability and is based on the premise of clinical supervision. Hunter (1973) states that her model

> . . .holds promise for pre-service and in-service education, teacher evaluation, merit pay, and teacher reeducation or dismissal, for it is based on defensible objective evidence revealed by performance (p. 4).

Hunter claims that her model will improve learning because it is based on research and that she has unraveled the connections between learning theory and the teacher behaviors that result in better learning. The teaching effectiveness model of Hunter's is known by several names including (1) Clinical Theory of Instruction, (2) Instructional Theory into Practice (ITIP), (3) Mastery Teaching, (4) Program for Effective Teaching (PET), (5) Clinical Teaching, (6) Target Teaching, (7) UCLA Model, and (8) The Hunter Model.

Hunter (1973) addresses the issue of accountability and its stature in the educational arena by stating,

> . . .as such, the production of successful teachers, continued training, the retraining or remediation of those in the field, and the accountability of schools for learning became a possibility in reality rather than an educator's or taxpayer's fantasy (p. 61).

Hunter contends that the possibility of increasing teacher accountability and effectiveness could be met by establishing objective criteria and properly training principals or supervisors to effectively communicate with teachers and "coach" them concerning the criteria.

Designed to improve classroom instruction through clinical supervision, the Program for Effective Teaching model shifts responsibility from accountability based on product to accountability based on the teacher's ability to follow specific steps to being more effective. Hunter's model has not been without controversy and strong criticism.

One of the strongest criticisms has been the implementation of the model for the sole purpose of teacher evaluation. A secondary criticism has been the negligent training and inservice provided to principals and supervisors expected to implement the program and maintain it in their schools.

Pavan (1986) stresses that Hunter has contributed greatly to American education, but that she allows trainers to misuse her work and she rejects the central tenet of clinical supervision. In comparing Hunter's model to that of Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1980) Pavan notes that Hunter does not advocate a preobservation conference which is to be the central tenet of clinical supervision. Pavan (1986) asserts that "by Hunter rejecting the central tenet of clinical supervision, that of true collaboration, she confuses others as to the meaning of true clinical supervision" (p. 67). Gibboney (1987) states that "Hunter's mechanistic and simplistic model does not improve the quality of education because it stifles teacher and student thinking" (p. 46). He further espouses that Hunter has not produced the research evidence to support her claim for improved learning.

Robbins and Wolfe (1987) note that Stallings (1985) four year study of the Hunter model in the Napa County Schools revealed that after three years of steady gains in student achievement scores, the fourth year exhibited a significant decrease. The research revealed the fourth year decline had to do with the "coaching" of teachers. During the fourth year of the study teachers were encouraged to implement colleague coaching and coach one another.

They were given minimum coaching by principals and supervisors. It was concluded that it was absolutely essential that principals or supervisors continually work with teachers in their role as "coach", as sometimes teachers do not feel they have the expertise to coach one another. It could be assumed the model was effective, but the research indicated it was not maintained.

While Slavin (1987) contends that Hunter's model does not necessarily harm student achievement, he does purport that the danger with her model is the "large-scale, mandated implementation of a stripped-down, formula-like application of her principles, as is occurring today" (p. 57). He further contends that the Hunter model mandates one method and shuts out alternatives with better chances of improving student achievement.

Another caveat toward the Hunter model came with the report of the Mandeville and Rivers (1989) study in the state of South Carolina. While they found no substantial differences in achievement scores between PET-trained teachers and students of other teachers, and in fact found student's scores of PET-trained teachers to be slightly lower, they did find the "quality of coaching" from principals and supervisors was the issue of focus.

Sheehan (1989), a South Carolina educator notes that

> . . .only through the development of a climate for change, through an analysis of the maturity level of the teacher, and through support by the building principal or supervisor will change take place (p. 4).

The attitudes of teachers, principals and supervisors affect the quality of any clinical supervision program and the effectiveness of its implementation.

Hopefully, by determining the attitudes of Arkansas school principals toward the Hunter model, Arkansas school leaders should be able to assess their future plans concerning the continued implementation of the

Program for Effective Teaching model, as well as any implementation of a new clinical supervision model.

Slavin (1989) notes that Hunter's model is another needle in the haystack of faddism, and that

> . . .if faddism in education is ever to end, decisions about adopting or maintaining programs must be based on reliable widely respected data, because faddism is so well entrenched in American education that uprooting it will take time and concerted effort. Otherwise, we will endlessly repeat the process that led us in and out of the open classroom, in and out of individualized instruction, and in and out of Madeline Hunter's model (p. 758).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to assess the attitudes of Arkansas school principals toward Hunter's model of Program for Effective Teaching. The study also assessed principal's reactions as to the value of the components of the Total Teaching Act, Instructional Skills, and the quality of PET training.

Significance of the Study

The Arkansas Department of Education (1980) adopted Hunter's model of Program for Effective Teaching (PET) in 1979 with the goal of making teaching more effective, efficient and relevant. In this program, the teacher and principal/supervisor have a common language for the supervision of teacher effectiveness. The attitude of warmth and encouragement is regarded as an important behavior that should be a necessary part of a classroom observation. The findings of this study should produce information pertaining to the attitudes of principals in Arkansas towards Hunter's model of Program of Effective Teaching. After an initial training period has been completed, it becomes the responsibility of the building principal to coach teachers in order to maintain the effectiveness of the program.

Therefore, the attitude of the principal toward this program is critical to the success of the instructional improvement since the principal is the

major change agent in the school. If the data reveals negative attitudes, then clinical supervision strategies can be implemented to initiate change in those attitudes. If the data reveals positive attitudes, then the clinical supervision strategies currently in place will be validated.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in the study and the results are listed below:

HO1 There was no significant difference between the attitudes of elementary, middle, junior, and high school principals toward the Program for Effective Teaching.

HO2 There was no significant difference in the perceived enhancement of supervisory skills derived from the training of elementary, middle, junior and high school principals.

HO3 There was no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary, middle, junior, and high school principals toward the quality of training in the PET program.

HO4 There was no significant difference between the attitudes of elementary, middle, junior and high school principals toward the maintenance of the Program for Effective Teaching in their schools.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms were operationalized specifically for the study.

1. Accountability - Being responsible for the teaching - learning interaction which takes place in schools.
2. Building Principal - The administrator in charge of a school.
3. Clinical Supervision - A specific supervisory approach to evaluation developed by Cogan which is concerned with improving instruction

through the use of a systematic analytical method based on observation of classroom events.

4. Coaching - The provision of on-site, personal support and technical assistance for teachers.

5. Educational Community - Administrators, supervisors, college teachers, members of professional organizations and boards of education, students, parents, and all other people involved in the educative process.

6. Elementary School Principal - An administrator in charge of a school that provides services to students in grades K-6.

7. Evaluation - An appraisal or judgment made about an individual's performance at work.

8. High School Principal - An administrator in charge of a school that provides services to students in grades 10-12.

9. Junior High School Principal - An administrator in charge of a school that provides services to students in grades 7-9.

10. Maintenance or Maintenance Plan - The use of follow-up measures to assist teachers in preserving or improving instructional techniques learned during initial PET training.

11. Middle School Principal - An administrator in charge of a school that provides services to students in grades 5-8.

12. Narrative - an anecdotal record.

13. Observation - The act of noticing or perceiving events in a classroom.

14. PET - Program for Effective Teaching.

15. PET Observer - A person who has completed two cycles of PET training and is qualified to observe PET participants.

16. PET Trainer - A person who has completed three cycles of PET training and is qualified to conduct PET training sessions.

17. Program for Effective Teaching - A teacher-training program based on the research and writings of Dr. Madeline Hunter.

18. Supervisor - Any administrator or observer who has the responsibility of evaluating teachers for the purpose of making them more effective and efficient.

19. Teacher - A person certified to teach K-12 students.

Delimitations of the Study

The population for the study was limited to all Arkansas public school building principals who had completed PET training. No surveys were mailed to private school or parochial school principals.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Goldhammer (1969) states,

> Good teaching requires intimacy, empathy, sensitivity, and psychological investment. . .(teachers') emotional capacities, their cognitive views, their views of life and of the world, their values, the terms in which they have learned to meet anxiety, and, altogether, their relationships to themselves represent their teaching essence (p. 365).

One of the most important subjects in education is the teaching of teachers; for without well-trained teachers, the classrooms will hardly achieve their intended purpose. What is desired is effective and efficacious teacher training that helps to develop a professionally qualified teacher. Hunter (1971) asserts that the professional skill of teaching is transmittable, and that teachers are made, not born. Hunter strongly feels the teacher is the most important factor in promoting the learning of students.

A supervisor of teachers is, essentially, not only a teacher himself, but also a manager. Every managerial decision relies on assumptions, generalizations, and hypotheses or theory. Very often, our assumptions are implicit, and frequently unconscious and conflicting. However, they determine our predictions that if we perform A, B, will take place. Thus, theory and practice are really one entity.

One common way of denying the importance of theory to managerial behavior is to maintain that management is an art. This also precludes critical analysis of the theoretical assumptions behind managerial

actions by placing reliance on intuitions and feelings, which by definition are not open to question.

The question is not if management is a science because it is not. Its goals are not the same. Science is interested in the advancement of knowledge. Management, as is true of any profession, is interested in the accomplishment of practical purposes. The problem is if management can utilize scientific knowledge in the attainment of those goals.

McGregor (1960) asserts that

> Human behavior is predictable, but, as in physical science, accurate prediction hinges on the correctness of the underlying theoretical assumptions. There is, in fact, no prediction without theory; all managerial decisions and actions rest on assumptions about behavior (p. 11).

Predicting teaching behavior is not a true science. The teaching supervisor or principal can only observe and base his evaluation on concepts that may be considered more subjective than scientific.

McGregor (1960) also states that

> Professions like medicine, education, and law in general maintain high ethical standards with respect to the influences they exert on human beings. In directing the human resources of the industrial organization, management is in a similar position. Here, as elsewhere in our society, the price of freedom is responsibility (p. 14).

It is the purpose of the clinical supervisor-teacher relationship to generate in the teacher a feeling for responsibility, if the teacher does not already have it. The teacher is ultimately responsible for his own actions, and the supervisor can only do so much in that direction. A responsible teacher in the classroom is truly a worthwhile objective.

The Nature of Clinical Supervision

The management of teachers or clinical supervision has as its responsibility and objective the professional growth and training of teachers.

Krajewski and Anderson (1980) stated the term "clinical supervision" was coined in 1961 by Cogan at Harvard University. Cogan (1973) used it in a proposal entitled Case Studies and Research in Clinical Supervision. (p. 421). At the time Cogan termed the phase it was met with a great deal of resistance. Cogan (1973) defined "clinical supervision" as follows:

> The rationale and practice designed to improve the teacher's classroom performance. It takes its principle data from the events of the classroom. The analysis of these data and the relationship between teacher and supervisor form the basis of the program, procedures, and strategies designed to improve the students' learning by improving the teacher's classroom behavior (p. 9).

The ideas for clinical supervision found root in the Harvard-Lexington and Harvard-Newton programs, which trained principals, supervisors, teachers and student teachers for their positions. Goldhammer (1969) summarized these early 1960's training programs as an introduction to planned supervision for teachers and administrators who were excited about the new concepts of cooperative teaching and team teaching.

According to Goldhammer (1969) during the early 60's clinical supervision was not a recognized discipline within the field of education. Both its motivation and methods seemed random and archaic, with teachers expecting supervisors to be punitive and supervisors not knowing what they were doing nor why. Goldhammer (1969) states, "teachers had been regarded as teaching machines and supervision as just plain trouble-making" (p. 368). There was not yet a solid curriculum in supervisor education, and notions about how to train and administer in the field were still greatly undecided. Literature was just beginning to take shape in the area of clinical supervision and Hunter who was first a psychologist and then an administrator who supervised teachers told Brandt (1985), "I had never heard of any of the people who were writing about clinical supervision because I was born and bred in psychology,

not education" (p. 62). Hunter's indoctrination to clinical supervision came during her tenure at University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) while serving as principal of the UCLA Lab School. Over the years she became formalized in the UCLA version of clinical supervision. Hunter concludes from her extensive observations and intensive research that teachers definitely do make a difference.

The UCLA model of clinical supervision requires no more than 15-20 minutes of observation to collect data and the supervisor analyzes that record to look for cause-effect relationships, particularly trends in teaching. In the UCLA model, the observer interprets what happened to the teacher, selecting out patterns or trends which, in the opinion of the observer, were enhancing the teacher's growth. The UCLA model stressed three elements:

1. Behavior of the teacher that had a high probability of enabling learning,
2. Behavior of the teacher that had probability of producing no learning, and
3. Behavior which had high probability of interfering with student learning.

As a result of the observer's analysis, the observer determined the objectives of the post-conference with the teacher which were to

1. Enhance the teacher's peaks,
2. Bring up the teacher's valleys or
3. To discard an irrelevant or non-productive behavior.

Hunter (1969) defines teaching as "a conscious stream of professional decisions made before, during and after instruction" (p. 2). It is Hunter's assertion that when decision-making is initiated, student learning will definitely increase. Through the years the clinical supervision model has been based on

conscious decision-making, and the teacher is the decision-maker. She stresses that through the use of her model teachers learn to base their decisions on sound theory rather than folklore and fantasy. Hunter (1984) contends that her instructional model is successful by going through three stages:

1. Propositional knowledge (awareness),
2. Procedural knowledge (practice), and
3. Conditional decision-making.

According to Krajewski (1982) clinical supervision entered the 60's and 70's as a warmly pursued topic. As the public called for more accountability, the school system attempted to meet their demand with consultant services for inservice training and supervision courses. Understanding clinical supervision is somewhat difficult. There are still more questions than answers. What are the skills needed for supervisors? Why should there be supervisors? What are the risks to the teachers? How can supervisors find the time to do the work? And how can they persuade the teachers to be receptive? Krajewski (1982) summarizes the theory of clinical supervision as follows:

> Deliberate intervention into the instructional process creates productive tension for both the teacher and supervisor. To reduce that tension requires supervision knowledge and training, mainly in collecting data. Clinical supervision is a method for improving instruction, goal-oriented, systematic, yet flexible, requiring role delineation, mutual trust and rapport nurturance (pp. 41-42).

Teachers sometimes have a negative feeling about being supervised even though it is a necessary part of their professional development. Some teachers tend to become defensive and seldom consider it to be beneficial. Acheson and Gall (1987) feel that some teachers profit from supervision, and some gifted supervisors are popular and effective in working

with teachers. Yet the weight of evidence supports the generalization. In a study of 2500 teachers, it was found that "only a small fraction of them (1.5 percent) perceived their supervisor as a source of new ideas" (p. 6).

The fact that so many teachers have a hostility toward clinical supervision might suggest the possibility that schools do away with it. A positive view of this situation is that teachers are only negative concerning the style of supervision they receive, not supervision itself. Perhaps teachers would react in a positive fashion to a supervisory attitude that is more responsive to their interests and hopes. Goldhammer (1969) believed the mission of supervision was

> To provide close, intimate relationships for the sake of the teachers' learning so that, in turn, the teachers could foster such personal relationships with their students and enhance their learning. The supervisor must know the frame of reference of the teacher, 'his values, his ideals, his concepts, his feelings and his anxieties' so that the teacher may find his way into the labyrinth of Johnny's experience to know what goes on there and affect what happens there intelligently and effectively (pp. 361-362).

This requires a teacher who is committed to learning and teaching and a supervisor who is willing to be as vulnerable as the teacher. Clinical supervision is founded on the belief that these close relationships are for the purpose of examination of teaching behaviors. Goldhammer (1969) felt that supervision must be mostly analytical, rational, and unmysterious. It should enhance, actualize and fulfill. It must produce objective, measurable accomplishments. It must be open, not closed, humane and creative.

Supervisory Practices and Negative Reactions

Professionals in the field of clinical supervision concern themselves with the necessary qualifications of a supervisor. This person should be highly skilled in the understanding of the school's mission and needs, be able to create and maintain an atmosphere that is mutually

supportive and conducive to positive change. There must be the delicate capability of winning the trust of teachers who simply do not like to have their work viewed by other professionals. Krajewski and Anderson (1980) states that,

> Supervisors don't necessarily need to be master teachers, but they must be experienced, more experienced than those they observe, empathetic and people whom the teachers do not fear. They must have expertise in analysis of teaching and in applying the principles of learning in a practical way (p. 422).

In traditional inservice supervision, the supervisor, in most instances the school principal, initiates the supervisory function to evaluate the teacher's performance. Acheson and Gall (1987) noted that in states such as California, Oregon, and Washington, the evaluation procedure may be mandated by state law, or by the local school board, or by Ministries of Education.

Goldhammer (1969) suggested that supervisors possibly need skills in adult psychology, time management and observation instrumentation. Supervisors must be sensitive to the new teacher who wants to succeed and the experienced teacher who wishes not to fail and lose status. Goldhammer (1969) states that "supervisors themselves often cannot exemplify good teaching, and this obvious double standard demoralizes sensitive teachers" (p. 8).

Hunter (1976) suggests the supervisory condition generates two problems from the beginning. First, supervision becomes associated with evaluation. Hunter (1976) states that evaluation should definitely be associated with her model. She feels the supervisor uses clinical supervision as a foundation for having a sampling of the teacher's performance on which to make an overall evaluation. This can create anxiety in some people when they realize they are being evaluated, particularly if negative evaluations threaten their livelihoods. The second difficulty is that supervision comes from a need of the supervisor, instead of from a need felt by the teacher.

Due to the fact that traditional supervision can tend to be unpleasant, interaction between supervisor and teacher can become somewhat superficial. What is particularly jarring to many teachers is when the supervisor appears as a surprise at the teacher's classroom to observe the activities. Hunter (1986) is a strong proponent of eliminating the preobservation conference between the teacher and observer in her clinical supervision model. She feels if there is a conference before observing the classroom its primary objective should be to develop trust and rapport with the teacher, identify agreed-upon objectives, and prepare both teacher and observer for a productive post observation conference. Hunter (1986) states

> In reality, that preobservation conference is not only a waste of time but it can create bias in both observer and teacher which interferes with objective observation of teacher performance and results in a less productive postobservation conference (p. 69).

The problem is that the teacher does not know what the supervisor expects during the preobservation conference or what the observer is looking for. Hunter feels that bias could exist in the mind of the observer, therefore creating a negative mindset. Hunter (1986) states, "knowing what is supposed to happen can cause 'seeing it happen' to the exclusion of what really is happening" (p. 69). Also, the supervisor himself may not have a definite plan concerning what he is going to observe. Consequently, the observation process becomes very unsystematic, subjective, and vague. Hunter (1986) does feel that the only use for a preobservation conference would be when it becomes the joint venture of planning a lesson. Hunter (1986) does not feel that collaboration and trust are achieved in most preobservation conferences, and this is one of the negative aspects of clinical supervision, but "trust is built in the postobservation conference if it increases the teacher's excellence" (p. 68).

There are positive aspects to clinical supervision. Goldhammer (1969) encouraged

> . . .constructive intimacy between teacher and supervisor, shown by affection for each other, compatible intensity and rate of growth, and focus on the teacher's issues, not the supervisor's, although there must be some sense in the relationship of how the teacher contributes to the supervisor's development. If the relationship is too one sided, the teacher becomes too vulnerable and cannot function (p. 364).

It could be concluded that a good match in these areas of emotion and personality is necessary to cultivate effective supervision. Glickman (1981) states "the supervisor is defined as a person with responsibility for improving a teacher's instruction" (p. 17). The supervisor might be a principal, subject area specialist, assistant principal, department chairperson, head teacher, or central office consultant. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971) suggests that all persons who participate in supervision, regardless of their duty and title are supervisors.

The improvement of a teacher's instructional approach is certainly a positive and worthwhile objective. If the teacher sees the supervisor as a helper instead of a threat to his position, there should be positive results for all concerned, from the supervisor to the teacher to the students. Sergiovanni (1987) suggests the perspective for clinical supervision is basically formative. He states that "the focus is on building teacher motivation and commitment, and providing for on-line staff development for teachers" (p. 191). He notes that a rational science of teaching and supervision give more emphasis to developing certain strategies that reflect a higher concern for values than goals and for patterns of learning than discrete outcomes. He further notes that supervision and teaching are at two levels: (1) observed behavior and (2) meaning and understanding.

Acheson and Gall (1987) take the same view as Glickman (1981) that

> . . .clinical supervision acknowledges the need for teacher evaluation under the condition that the teacher participates with the supervisor in the process. The primary emphasis of clinical supervision is on professional development, however. It is supervision to help the teacher improve his or her instructional performance (p. 11).

They feel this positive objective is accomplished first of all by the supervisor having a planning conference with the teacher. Thus there are no surprises. During the planning conference, the teacher has a chance to voice personal problems, needs, and whatever else is on the teacher's mind. It is the supervisor's task to help the teacher bring these perceptions into finer focus so that both of them have a good understanding of the teacher's present instructional techniques, and if there are any inconsistencies. Sergiovanni (1987) contends that no stage is more important than the preobservation or planning conference.

The next step would be for the supervisor and teacher to examine new methods which the teacher could possibly use to transfer the present instruction methods to a more ideal approach.

Because teaching can be quite an isolated experience, and teachers seldom have an opportunity to share their ideas, clinical supervision can fulfill this very important need. Acheson and Gall (1987) state that

> . . .supervisors can meet this need by using a different approach with helping the teacher clarify goals, collecting observational data on classroom events, and analyzing the data for discrepancies. For teachers who are not aware of their goals or how they come across in the classroom, this process can be a useful guide (p. 12).

Classroom observation by the supervisor would be the next step after the preobservation or planning conference. However, because of the conference, the teacher is not likely to view the observation as a threat. Both

the teacher and supervisor should have a clear understanding of what is being observed, and it should be a constructive, positive experience.

The last phase of clinical supervision is for supervisor and teacher to take part in a feedback conference. Sergiovanni (1987) suggests this stage is a natural springboard to staff development for both the teacher and supervisor, in the fact that the post conference is the end of one cycle and the beginning of another. This consists of reviewing the observational information, with the supervisor inviting the teacher to state his own conceptions concerning teaching effectiveness. While the teacher examines the observational information, the feedback conference often develops into a planning conference, with supervisor and teacher agreeing together that additional observational informational is necessary, or they might plan some kind of self - improvement program for the teacher. Schoppmeyer and Coppola (1989) stress that this is where suggestions, ideas, concepts, and beliefs, both positive and negative are communicated. They contend that effective communication is the key to the potential of the conference to upgrade teacher behavior. Acheson and Gall (1987) state, "In brief, clinical supervision is any model of supervision that contains three phases: planning or preobservation conference, classroom observation, and feedback conference" (p. 13).

Direct teacher and supervisor interaction, as well as the teacher's professional growth are the most outstanding characteristics of clinical supervision.

Glatthorn (1984) states that

> Clinical supervision is an intensive process designed to improve instruction by conferring with the teacher on lesson planning, observing the lesson, analyzing the observational data, and giving the teacher feedback about the observation (p. 7).

Thus, Glatthorn (1984) and Acheson and Gall (1987) have basically the same conceptions concerning the clinical supervision of teachers. Hunter (1979) states that the overall mission of clinical supervision is to

> *Increase instructional excellence. . .we know that to increase* excellence you need to know what you are doing well, what you are doing that is not as good as it could be and what is necessary in order to improve it (p. 58).

There are thousands of individuals in the United States who provide inservice education to teachers on either a full time or part time basis. According to Acheson and Gall (1987) the fundamental methods of clinical supervision are concerned with speaking, listening, influencing, and observing. As a consequence of this, there is a universality to the entire process. However, Hunter (1985) states that the fundamental research base for her model of clinical supervision began with Thorndike who showed that "practice in itself without knowledge of results of what was right and what was wrong and how to fix it, did not improve performance" (p. 58).

Hunter further contends the purpose behind all of this is to provide improved and effective instruction for the students in the classroom, and clinical supervision helps to accomplish this objective as a result of more capable teachers. Therefore, clinical supervision has as its objective a positive and constructive goal: the betterment of teachers. Very likely most teachers would not feel intimidated by this approach and could only benefit from it.

Clinical Supervision and Effective Teaching

Acheson and Gall (1987) define supervision ". . as the process of helping the teacher reduce the discrepancy between actual teaching behavior and ideal teaching behavior" (p. 27). In this concept of supervision it is necessary for teachers and supervisors to specify what they mean by ideal or

effective instruction. By arriving at a definition, there will be a basis for establishing supervision objectives and evaluating their attainment.

Some educators believe that effective teaching is so complicated that it is all but impossible to really define or analyze. There are other educators who say they are not able to actually define good teaching, but they know it when they see it. Acheson and Gall (1987) believe that teachers and supervisors can come to some serviceable definitions of good teaching to direct the supervisory process. Their definition of a good teacher is

> . . .one who has positive relationships with students; deals with students' emotions; maintains discipline and control; creates a favorable environment for learning; recognizes and provides for individual differences; enjoys working with students; obtains student's involvement in learning, is creative and innovative; emphasizes teaching of reading skills; gives students a good self-image; engages in professional growth activities; knows subject matter in depth; is flexible; is consistent; and displays fairness (p. 28).

Not all educators would agree with this list, but it covers most the characteristics of a good teacher. It is also important for the supervisor to be cognizant of the various phases a teacher will undergo before arriving at proficiency. According to Campbell, Cordis, McBeath, and Young (1987) the phases relating to mastering the teaching process are "unaware, aware, awkward, consciously competent, and internalized" (p. 16).

The teacher who is unaware has no knowledge of the skills, strategies, or processes that go into good teaching. The teacher is not able to evaluate or reflect on teaching behavior.

At the aware stage, the teacher has the academic knowledge of the teaching process, but has not attempted to implement it, or is having difficulties implementing it. Thus the intellectual factor is there, but the actual practice has yet to be achieved.

The awkward phase of a teacher is when he employs unnatural classroom methods which are forced and mechanistic. This teacher may be so concerned with how to teach that he does not pay sufficient attention to what is being taught.

When a teacher is consciously competent, he uses skills, strategies, and processes in a proficient fashion. However, his teaching is not automatic because the teacher has to think too much concerning the performance of an act. There is still to much intellectual and not enough spontaneous action.

When a teacher is at the internalized stage, he uses instructional skills automatically. Specific skills or strategies become part of a series. The teaching act seems natural for the teacher and seems natural to the observer. Teaching processes are employed appropriately and spontaneously.

Taking a closer look at supervisory behavior, it is certainly true that it occurs within a complex system involving the interaction between and among initiating, human, and school effectiveness variables. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) state

> The supervisor, for example behaves (1) in an organizational environment, (2) from an authority base, (3) in specific ways, (4) in an attempt to modify the mediating variables in a fashion which increases staff identity and commitment, and (5) with the goal of increasing some dimension of school effectiveness (p. 40).

The ultimate objective of supervision is to further develop educational programs and promote instructional effectiveness in the school.

In many ways, schools are similar to other large organizations. The operation of a good-sized elementary or secondary school is in most instances marked by an emphasis on conserving resources through sophisticated management techniques, scientific staff utilization, computerized scheduling, multiple program offerings, and a considerable number of student

services. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) believe that in large cities, the diversity of the schools' objectives, along with the great number of employees, often renders them quite comparable in complexity to other big organizations. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) believe the supervisor is a manager in a large organization. However, they also suggest there are many ways in which to measure teaching effectiveness, and that even without knowing anything concerning a teacher, a supervisor can make evaluations about his teaching by observing the teacher's students.

According to Acheson and Gall (1987) some of the indicators of effective teaching, with regard to student behavior and performance, are that students are learning the knowledge, understanding, skills, and attitudes intended by the curriculum, as measured by performance on tests; students demonstrate independent behavior in learning the curriculum; students show behaviors that reveal a positive attitude toward the curriculum and the school; students reflect behaviors that indicate a positive attitude toward the teacher and their peers; students show behaviors that reflect a positive attitude toward themselves as learners; students do not have behavior problems in class; students appear to be actually involved in learning the curriculum while the class is in session.

Acheson and Gall (1987) also suggest that supervisors should analyze test results to reach a conclusion concerning how well students are learning the curriculum, either over a short unit of study or over a school year. Supervisors can observe if students demonstrate behaviors that reveal a positive attitude toward various elements of schooling, and if students behave well during class activities.

Another way for developing criteria of good teaching is the teacher's planning efforts. It is essential for the supervisor to know the teacher's

intent and instructional goals in order to properly evaluate the effectiveness of a teacher's classroom behavior.

Hunter (1980) suggests there are several possible indicators of quality in the teacher's planning efforts. She feels it is possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher's rationale in selecting instructional objectives, curriculum materials, and evaluation technique. She states, "the teacher's rationale can be determined by the supervisor and the teacher discussing and examining the written lesson plans" (p. 410).

She also suggests another indicator of good planning would be reflected in the teacher's approach to revising instructional plans, if necessary, based on the results of classroom performance.

It is extremely important for the supervisor to have an understanding of the teacher's classroom objectives. This is important in order for the supervisor to accurately judge the teacher's performance before his students.

Still another way to measure a teacher's effectiveness is in an environment other than the classroom. These criteria could include the effectiveness with which the teacher takes part in school activities; cooperates with colleagues; and is involved in professional development programs.

In all instances, a good rapport between the supervisor and the teacher is most important for effective teaching to find its way to the classroom.

Clinical Supervision and Teacher Evaluation

If classroom objectives are to be met, it is most essential for an effective and realistic system of teacher evaluation to be established.

It may be true that the ultimate purpose of clinical supervision is to assist teachers to grow and improve through cooperative planning, observation, and feedback. However, it is important to remember that the supervision

process is usually a part of a larger system that has as its objective decisions concerning tenure, promotion, retention, and dismissal.

Hunter (1973) contends teachers should be cognizant of the criteria which will be used to evaluate their performance. These standards involve specific guidelines for a particular teacher in a certain classroom situation; and also, general criteria that can be applied to all teachers in a school district.

Usually, these general criteria are conceived and formulated most preferably by a committee of teachers, administrators, and other persons in the school community. After this step, the general criteria are then adopted by the school board as official policy before copies are given to all of the teachers. Hunter (1973) asserts that when a teacher has an understanding of the evaluation process, a more positive climate has been established.

She further contends the number of standards should be kept under control and that one method to achieve this objective is to identify fifteen to twenty general standards, each with three to five indicators stated in explicit, behavioral terminology. A standard consists of three parts:

1. A statement that establishes a general behavior;
2. A list of indicators which describe the manner in what that behavior will be identified; and
3. A supervisor's evaluation concerning the level of competent performance.

Acheson and Gall (1987) state that

> Over the years, our notions have changed about what the criteria of good teaching should be. In the 1950s we looked at the characteristics of good teachers - personality variables, qualities of character, and the like. In the 1960s attention shifted to what teachers do, or should do, as part of the teaching process. These behaviors were often called competencies. Since the 1970s we have tended to talk about teacher

> effectiveness in terms of what students are able to do before and after working with a particular teacher (p. 48).

The problem with all of this is that the most common source of information has been the supervisor's subjective feelings, which are influenced by such things as the teacher's attitude, personality, social patterns, and other considerations which may be significant to a certain degree, but not highly important to teaching effectiveness.

What is needed is a more objective approach by the clinical supervisor. Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1981) state that

> We need a supervision whose effect is to enhance and to actualize and to fulfill, in degrees that are appreciable and sensible in the teacher's own experimental frameworks. Teachers (like anyone) must be able to understand what they are doing and the goals and processes that govern their behavior, and supervision must provide adequate illumination for such understanding. We require a supervision that is basically teacher-initiated and consistent with independent, self - sufficient action. Our supervision must result, regularly and systematically, in palpable technical advancement; it must have methodological and conceptual rigor and it must produce real and measurable accomplishments (p. 206).

Due to the ambiguity around most educational subjects, such a supervision must be open rather than closed; it must result in discoveries; and must decide on its own directions instead of being committed to false, archaic, or other unsubstantial objectives.

Both the supervision itself and the teaching behaviors with which it concludes must be fundamentally creative and should not attempt, as supervision has attempted historically, to arrive at increased degrees of conformity and uniformity in instructional procedures.

It is critical that supervision be basically humane. Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski (1981) states that

> It is crucially important to have a supervision that is fundamentally humane, one that is emancipated from the dogma and authoritarianism

> and vested interests of administration and just plain troublemaking that have typified much of the supervision we have known before (p. 206).

Very likely, clinical supervision is not an educational panacea, but its general approach and specific habits of technique are appropriate for most situations.

It is important for our concepts of teaching and of supervision to be modified continually as more is learned concerning human behavior and professional development. Even today solid curricula in teacher education and supervision education are yet in the initial stages of development; and there are not many school systems that serve as the field basis for the required research and development functions.

An examination of any school districts' standards would probably reveal that they serve several objectives. They serve as the reference for contract renewal, promotions, and tenure decisions. They also function as an important part in dismissal hearings, arbitration, and litigation concerning teacher evaluation.

Acheson and Gall (1987) suggest that

> Teacher evaluation in the past has sometimes made use of several sources of information. Observation by supervisors is one. Another is student ratings of teachers. Systematic observation instruments used by others besides supervisors form another possibility. So does self-evaluation. Gains shown by students, as measured by test scores or other criteria, are another possible source. Scores on standardized teaching tests might be used (p. 48).

Once a school district has a set of standards, there are several possibilities as to how they can be employed in the process of evaluating teachers. The use of personal characteristics as the foundation for summative evaluations has a lengthy tradition, but has not been very useful in either encouraging teachers to change or dismissing those who show no improvement.

Another possible procedure is to use the processes as absolute standards. Teachers who are new to the profession may welcome the reassurance of a explicit set of expectations. Hunter (1986) states that

> At the very beginning of the school year is the opportune time for supervisors to make teachers aware that their involvement in the district clinical supervision program will be an integral part of the standards concerning their yearly observations and evaluations (p. 68).

Another possible use of official standards is to stress student outcomes. Some teachers feel anxiety about too much stress being placed on what their pupils accomplish.

It would probably be a considerable undertaking if a teacher were evaluated on the basis of a complete list of district standards. A more realistic method would be to concentrate on a few items that are of concern to the teacher and agree to these as objectives for a given year. The formal evaluation is then established on the progress that was made toward achieving the objectives. If the teacher experiences serious difficulties in mid-year, the objectives should be modified to deal with the problem.

Teachers most likely have an inclination to search for safe objectives when they realize they will be evaluated on the basis of them. The supervisor should have some skill at negotiating goals that are significant. Stating objectives clearly also requires skill.

Frequently, teachers are not too skilled at writing clear goal statements, and certain supervisors are not very proficient at writing formal evaluations. When a dismissal takes place and the teacher has had ten years of these somewhat abstract and hazy evaluations, it is not easy to make the case. If one objective for the formal evaluation is to help the teacher's development in instructional effectiveness, then vague generalities in the report are not at all

helpful. According to Hunter (1988) clinical supervision can be the heart of an effective teacher evaluation system.

Goal Setting Techniques and Planning for Observation

According to Acheson and Gall (1987) there are two parts to the initial phase of the clinical supervision process that require planning conferences between the supervisor and the teacher: goal setting and planning for observation.

Goal setting is a most important step in the observation process. Goals provide a purpose to the entire clinical supervision procedure. All teachers need to work toward tangible, reachable, and significant objectives. Teachers who are working on development goals, instead of deficiency needs, can have a goal-setting conference that is teacher centered. Other teachers, who are on plans of assistance, may have a need to have evaluator-centered goal-setting conferences.

The primary emphasis should be that the principle objective of clinical supervision is to assist teachers to improve their classroom instruction. Sergiovanni (1987) suggests that the way to reach this objective is to use a goal-setting conference to identify areas of instruction in which a teacher needs to improve. Hunter (1983) uses the term "coaching" instead of goal-setting and states that one of the major problems with her model is that supervisors are not being adequately trained in the coaching process. Hunter (1983) laments that trainers take a quick crash course to acquire the propositional knowledge of her model and usually acquire only limited script-taking skills. Then they are expected to teach others, and coach them with limited knowledge of how to translate the model. Hunter (1983) strongly feels that a coach is a person who has the skills to enable another person to perform better, and this is very

different from practice. She contends that a lot of what people are calling coaching is really practicing just working together.

A supervisor might inquire of a teacher concerning what areas he would like to improve as a teacher, but according to some experts this approach is not normally effective. Acheson and Gall (1987) feel that many teachers have not arrived at self-improvement objectives and feel somewhat intimidated when asked to do so.

They suggest a more practical approach is to assist the teacher in identifying concerns. A teacher who is able to identify and verbalize concerns can, in most instances, take the next steps of examining the problems objectively and solving them. Hunter (1986) believes this is the equivalent of the teacher using conscious level decision-making skills.

There are many questions a supervisor could ask to direct the teacher's thinking about concerns. Of course, no one question is better than another. The supervisor should be intent on assisting the teacher to disclose real concerns without feeling threatened. A teacher who is threatened is more likely to be quiet or reveal only safe problems. Garman and Hazi (1988) revealed in their study of 200 Pennsylvania teachers that a large percentage did not feel comfortable in voicing concerns about using the Hunter clinical supervision model due to the fact

> The model became part of their school district's official policy on teacher evaluation; and administrators used the model as a template for evaluating (and sometimes for reprimanding) teachers (p. 670).

For instance, the teachers stated that the disciplining of students was a topic of safe concern, but any discussion of individualization of instruction was another matter entirely. If a teacher should bring up an instructional problem, he could be considered an incompetent, whereas a teacher who

brings up a discipline concern is more likely to be considered well along the pathway heading toward being a good teacher.

There are surely teachers who claim that they have no instructional problems and that their class is running quite smoothly. In certain instances this may be an accurate perception by the teacher, but it is certainly true that there is always room for improvement in a person's teaching. Even a thoroughly competent teacher can find areas in which he needs to improve. Hunter (1984) feels that even the master teacher can improve, and that a great many of the basic propositions in her model were identified from observation of successful teachers.

With some clinical supervision models a checklist is sometimes useful in helping a teacher to evaluate his teaching performance. Usually, the concerns of preservice teachers and new inservice teachers tend to center on the self. The problems of experienced teachers are more related to their students. However, Hunter (1984) is emphatic that her model is not designed to be used as a checklist, and that any supervisor that does so is misusing and abusing the model and has not been properly trained. Furthermore, she contends with a checklist system they are only adding more paperwork to an already cumbersome task.

Acheson and Gall (1987) feels the planning conference provides the teacher and supervisor with a chance to identify teacher concerns and translate them into observable behaviors, and would eliminate any need of a checklist. Hunter (1986) contends that a planning conference is not to be considered a preobservation conference. In the planning conference the observer and the teacher collaborate in the design of a lesson, which the teacher subsequently teaches, but she feels the responsibility for successful learning outcomes is jointly shared. Acheson and Gall (1987) feel the planning

conference or preobservation conference is what establishes the groundwork for effective clinical supervision.

One of the principle objectives of the planning conference is to provide an opportunity for the teacher to communicate with another educator concerning a particular classroom situation and styles of teaching. Teachers are inclined to feel isolated in what they do because they usually teach alone in a self-contained classroom.

They feel that by the supervisor observing the teacher's classroom on a frequent basis, the supervisor establishes a set of shared experiences that he and the teacher can discuss together in their conferences. These conferences are particularly significant to the teacher who may have no one else in the school environment other than the supervisor with whom to share problems and perceptions.

A planning conference does not have to be especially lengthy. Acheson and Gall (1987) suggest the supervisor might allow twenty to thirty minutes for the first planning conference unless the teacher has an unusually complicated concern to discuss. On the contrary, Hunter (1986) states emphatically that a preobservation conference (not the same as a planning conference) is a "waste of time" (p. 69). Hunter feels the

> Preobservation conference can create bias in both observer and teacher which interferes with objective observation of teacher performance and results in a less productive postobservation conference (p.69)

If a planning or preobservation conference does take place it is critically important that it takes place during a mutually convenient time with the teacher and the supervisor. This should provide the teacher with a feeling of some control over the supervisory process.

Classroom Observation Techniques

Observation is the process through which a supervisor becomes cognizant of the events, interactions, physical elements, and problems in the classroom during a specified period of time. Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski (1981) state

> In clinical supervision, observation is the link between the promise made (in preobservation, to seek answers to the teacher's questions) and the promises kept (in the postobservation conference). It is what a supervisor does in order to be able to test whether answers can in fact be found (p. 71).

Depending on the official position of the supervisor, whether it be principal or a district central office supervisor, the presence of that supervisor in the classroom may itself be a situation to take into account. If it should happen that the supervisor is also the principal of the school, his established relationship with the teacher and students might be either a growth-providing situation, a disabling situation, or neither. Some scholars in the field of clinical supervision contend that supervisory work is best assigned to those who are not in direct authoritative relationship to the teachers, but instead are in a staff position with no responsibility for evaluating, discharging, firing, or promoting. Schoppmeyer and Coppola (1989) state "a peer or colleague may well need to be involved. Another faculty member may be particularly strong in a specific area of instruction" (p. 10). They suggest if another staff member is having difficulty in a particular area, then it seems reasonable to use the stronger instructor to help the weaker. This would provide for a professional relationship between equals which could well be termed clinical supervision

The fact is very few school systems make the required investment for this particular purpose, and so line-officer principals provide most of the supervisory assistance, for better or for worse. This could possibly be a harmful process in the long run, with not enough objectivity on the part of the supervisor.

Glickman (1981) suggests that one technique to use during the observation process could be for the supervisor to use a checklist at five minute intervals. Whenever the supervisor observes one of the students listening to the teacher, engaging in classroom discussion, or doing assigned work, he puts a check in the attentive to task box. If the supervisor observes one of the students vacantly staring into space or sitting with his head on the desk, he puts a check in the inattentive/passive box. This continues until the appropriate boxes have been checked. Then the supervisor requests that the teacher meet with him to go over the observation.

With this particular aspect of the Glickman (1981) model it would be important for the supervisor to arrange with the teacher for an opportunity to observe the classroom instruction when there is likely to be verbal interchange between teacher and students.

Also, with the supervisor recording the teacher's verbal feedback statements, it may also be helpful for the supervisor to record the immediately preceding student remark or action that prompted the feedback.

As with question classification, it is not always a simple matter to determine if a particular teacher remark is an instance of verbal feedback. Usually, the supervisor will have to depend on his judgment to decide if a specific remark is likely to be seen by a student as feedback on his behavior. Consequently, the supervisor must be a close observer of students' responses and the total instructional context. Hunter (1983) points out that another observational problem is that if the supervisor and teacher have different locations in the classroom while the supervisor is script- taking that he and the teacher are possibly seeing and hearing two different happenings.

If it should be the situation that the principal is also the supervisor in the classroom, it is hoped that the teacher has acquired a certain amount of

respect and trust for principal/supervisor. Schoppmeyer and Coppola (1989) point out that there could be circumstances in which there is a mutual dislike between the supervisor and teacher, and this can color an observation in many ways. They contend if this is the case then the teacher will start out prejudged and nothing will be done proper and some small event will be blown out of all proportion. It is hoped that the principal/ supervisor has visited the teacher's classroom before and is, therefore, not an unusual factor in the experience of the teacher and the children.

It is also hoped that the moment of observation does not have any unanticipated or negative conditions. Possibly, something could go wrong between the preobservation or planning conference and the time scheduled for the observation.

Objectivity in the observation process is not always an easy thing for the supervisor to practice. The supervisor sometimes brings his own subjective views into the classroom situation. It would certainly be difficult for him not to do so.

Another problem could be the mood of the supervisor. As a human being, the supervisor is likely as anybody to be subject to temperamental, emotional, and situational fluctuations. Consequently, perceptions, and subsequent observations, are usually influenced by the momentary mood and feelings of the supervisor.

The observation process is not easy, but it is vitally important with regard to teacher growth and improvement.

Styles of Clinical Supervision

There are various styles of supervision. The most common distinction is the direct style as opposed to the indirect styles.

Hunter (1980) contends that some supervisors are inclined to dominate the conversation. The teacher in this situation has little opportunity to identify goals and objectives, analyze and interpret information, or read decisions concerning future possibilities.

Hunter (1980) asserts that teachers lecture to students about two - thirds of the time they teach, and supervisors talk in approximately the same proportions to teachers. It can become a problem to attend to a teacher's difficulties in a conference or encourage a teacher's plan for improvement when the supervisor monopolizes the entire conference. There is no give and take between the supervisor and teacher.

A supervisor should refrain from giving direct advice as much as possible. It is important to allow teachers to analyze and interpret. A teacher should learn to make his own decisions; and once he has some experience at this, should be able to supervise himself.

It is a positive situation for a teacher to have his ideas reinforced by a supportive supervisor. Acheson and Gall (1987) state

> Some people are naturally compliant, submissive, obedient; perhaps they enjoy being told what to do. Nevertheless, our experience with teachers indicates that most of them prefer to feel responsible for their own actions. People who choose teaching as a career expect to be in charge of their classes; they expect to make professional decisions about goals, subject matter, materials, methodology, evaluation, and other aspects of the educational process (p. 174).

Acheson and Gall (1987) also contend that the supervisor in his conferences with the teachers, should be placing emphasis on assisting the teacher to identify objectives relating to classroom performance and then securing valid feedback to help in attaining those goals.

They feel sometimes it is most difficult for teachers to separate their personal problems with certain objectives from professional goals; and it is particularly troublesome to separate personal conflicts from professional ones.

A considerable number of problems supervisors identify as deterrents to professional development by their teachers have their foundation in personal considerations of a teacher's life. These problems can range from apathy to a lack of organization.

If personal problems on the part of the teacher could be excluded from the conference, it would be so much easier for the teacher and the supervisor to arrive at career objectives. However, some supervisors have had the experience of a teacher becoming very emotional and crying during the conference. The analyzing of human behavior is a extremely personal procedure that often defies scientific methods.

Because of this, Acheson and Gall (1987) believe the supervisor needs to have ways of handling these situations as they come up. It would not be appropriate for the supervisor to be in tears along with the teacher; however, some indication of sympathy or empathy would be very much in line.

They feel a type of client centered counseling might be an appropriate approach for a supervisory conference with a teacher. The supervisor does not necessarily have any more knowledge than the teacher concerning the matter. However, it is within the supervisor's area to consider what the teacher says about personal concerns in the perspective of how they relate to classroom performance, and how it is affecting their teaching. A sufficient level of trust is important with regard to how helpful a supervisor can be to a teacher with a personal concern that may be getting in the way of classroom effectiveness. Acheson and Gall (1987) suggest that one method of building a teacher's confidence in a supervisor is for the supervisor to show some ability to exhibit sensitivity to a teacher's personal conflict or concern. They further suggest that the supervisor attempt to provide positive and useful

feedback and move the conference from a negative tone to a more positive tone.

In certain instances, a supervisor must take full charge of the handling of certain teachers. This involves choosing the types of data that will be gathered and then analyzing and interpreting the information, arriving at conclusions concerning which goals are being met and which are not, and determining what should be done in the future. However, at the other extremes, a supervisor may encourage some teachers to establish their own goals, choose appropriate information to use in evaluating the achievement of those goals, and make decisions concerning future directions. Hunter (1982) states these approaches are usually either didactic or heuristic as pedagogical strategies. How much structure supervisors provide for a conference will depend on their evaluation of the type of atmosphere, which they will allow for maximum potential for the development of a specific teacher.

Acheson and Gall (1987) went on to say,

> We have found that when teachers are given a choice of supervisors, some choose one they know to be quite direct whereas other prefer one who tends to be indirect. Teachers who prefer the direct approach may say 'I know where he stands' or 'He tells it like it is' or 'I'm tired of people bouncing everything off the wall.'" Those who like an indirect style may say 'I feel more comfortable with Mary; she doesn't act like she has all the answers' or 'Fred helps me do my own thinking and treats me like a colleague' or 'I've had enough of the 'Hardsell' approach (p. 178).

Consequently, the supervisor who is observing is often cast in a double role. He is a colleague helping to improve a teacher's instruction as well as an evaluator. It is frequently difficult for the supervisor to cope with these two functions at the same time.

Schoppmeyer and Coppola (1989) state,

> There may well be something about a teachers activities which merit criticism, but it is important to not belabor the deficiencies. Most

> people are quite cognizant of what they are doing and what is wrong with it (p. 31).

They contend this is no place for a sermon and if the supervisor clearly and definitely states the difficulties or concerns that should be sufficient. Teachers who are borderline cases need to be informed of this fact, but the conference can still be one with positive and growth producing results. Teachers should have an early notice of deficiencies and assistance in any efforts to overcome them.

There may be situations in which it is necessary to force teacher compliance to the supervisor's demands. This could be when laws or official school policies are part of the problem. Seldom are the problems clear and definitive. The difficulty is to get the teacher to change from bad methods to effective teaching procedures. If there is an emotional reason why the teacher is having problems performing well, there is little that the supervisor can do, except to help the teacher rethink his entire instructional approach.

Rethinking on the part of the teacher is the first step toward any change in the teacher's methods and performance in the classroom. Although a supervisor should most probably not attempt to be a counselor to a teacher, it is certainly true that it is all but impossible to separate a teacher's personal problems from their instructional difficulties.

This is why it is helpful for the supervisor to assist the teacher to rethink his problems and his classroom situation. The teacher can only change himself, but it is essential for the supervisor to at least guide him in a positive and fulfilling direction to a better chance of achieving teaching success.

The teaching profession may well be the most difficult and unrewarding pursuit in the world when the classroom situation is proving to be unsatisfactory. On the other hand, there is no substitute for success in the

teaching profession. When a teacher can see that his students are really learning, there is every reason to feel a sense of significant achievement.

Conclusion

Hunter (1982) contends that in a sense, the teaching profession is both a science and an art. It is a science because experiments are always being conducted in order to arrive at improved teaching techniques in the classroom.

As a former psychologist, Hunter (1982) contends there is considerable psychology involved in the educational process. On the other hand, she feel that teaching is also an art due to the fact that there are so many intangibles, and teachers very often must rely on their instincts for the right effect. A teacher, in many ways, is a performer, who very often must ad lib through comments coming from the students in every direction.

Campbell, Cordis, McBeath, and Young (1987) state,

> The teacher and supervisor may choose to focus on content knowledge and level of conceptualization. The supervisor in this case may suggest that the teacher undertake opportunities for input on school, system, and provincial committees and professional groups, especially in the area of curriculum. This type of interaction may assist the teacher in listening to the ideas of others and incorporating them into his/her own thinking and may assist in identifying relationships between diverse curricular areas. During supervision, emphasis could usefully be placed on the consideration of alternative strategies and their application in a variety of curriculum areas (p. 21).

The relationship between the clinical supervisor and the teacher is one of the most important factors in achieving classroom effectiveness. It is at the level of the conference between the supervisor and teacher that strategies and techniques are suggested and later on brought to the stage of implementation.

Without a doubt, the supervisor-teacher relationship is recognized as a most important ingredient in the correction of teacher conflicts and the improvement of teacher techniques.

Acheson and Gall (1987) concluded that the systematic training of intelligence is an extremely complicated endeavor. Clinical supervision has the purpose of attaining relationships for the assistance of the teacher, and to promote the teacher's establishment of such relationships with their students and among their students.

Its observational and dialectical approaches reveal a basic value concerning closeness between supervisors and teachers, and between teachers and students. Clinical supervision is one of the most important steps toward effective teaching, and the attitudes of both the supervisor and the teacher toward the clinical supervision program are the basis for the successful implementation of the program.

Concerning the numerous clinical supervision models on the market that purport to be the right way and the only way Haggerson (1987) states,

> If we could agree that it is important to recognize that Cogan, Goldhammer and Anderson were the originators of clinical supervision in this century, would we allow Madeline Hunter, who did not study any of their original works, to use the term 'clinical supervision' to name what she does that is very different from what they meant by clinical supervision (p. 28)?

He further suggests that once a position (text) is made public, the intentional fallacy is operative. That is the intentions of the author mean little in what happens to the text. This could very well explain why Hunter is so active in

inservicing teachers all over the world; that is to insure that her intentions do make a difference. Haggerson (1987) also states,

> Our proclivity to declare one model or way of doing something has, in my opinion taken us on a spin of evaluating teachers by the numbers, which may have dire consequences in the long run (p. 30).

Summary

The goal of any clinical supervision model is the improvement of instruction and thereby improvement in students achievement. Most clinical supervision models are not designed for evaluating teachers for administrative purposes. Clinical supervision is the provision of supervisory help to the individual teacher. It is formative in nature, designed to assist the teacher to improve instruction.

The typical clinical supervision model calls for a one-on-one, face - to-face relationship between the teacher and supervisor. Clinical supervision should always focus on the events that takes place in the classroom.

Most clinical supervision models postulates a cycle that consists of a number of stages or phases. Minimally, most clinical supervision models would have three stages: preobservation or planning conference, observation, and postobservation conference.

The primary purpose of the preobservation or planning conference is for the teacher and supervisor to make plans for the supervisor's forthcoming visit to the classroom. The next stage of the model is the classroom observation. Two types of observations are specific and global. The final stage is the postobservation conference after the supervisor has organized and analyzed collected data.

Clinical supervision requires the supervisor to possess skills in observing, diagnosis, prescribing and conferencing. The supervisor must

exhibit attitudes of a helping relationship and exhibit a sincere interest in the teacher's growth.

It is possible for a teacher's peer to assume the role of clinical supervisor, however the provision of release time, personnel, and materials pose a problem for school systems. Alternatives to the clinical supervision model have been suggested such as an artistic approach to supervision, differentiated supervision, and supportive supervision. Although more research is needed, there are strong indicators that clinical supervision can be effective.

Arkansas Program for Effective Teaching

The following summary describes the efforts to present a staff development/clinical supervision program concerned with teaching in the local school districts in Arkansas. The information is a compilation of various reports obtained from the State Department of Education.

The Arkansas Department of Education was the appropriate agency to provide leadership to initiate a statewide staff development/clinical supervision program. The leadership function of the department was perceived to be a cooperative and collaborative relationship among local school districts and institutions of higher education.

During the 1979-80 school year, the Arkansas Department of Education, in cooperation with institutions of higher education and local education agencies, initiated a comprehensive staff development/clinical supervision program in school districts throughout Arkansas. The Program for Effective Teaching (PET) (Hunter model) was used for the staff development/ clinical supervision program in Arkansas.

The program was introduced to Arkansas by Dr. Don Roberts, former Director of Education. He had initiated the development of the program with his former staff in Newport News, Virginia, where he had been the

superintendent of schools. The Program for Effective Teaching (PET) model was developed by Bill Etheridge (1978) of the Newport News Public Schools, after he had participated in an inservice training program directed by Dr. Madeline Hunter, principal of the UCLA lab school in California. Etheridge synthesized a training model for use with Newport News teachers as a staff development/clinical supervision effort to improve instruction in order to raise student achievement levels in basic subject areas.

Dr. Roberts felt the need for improving the instructional and supervisory skills of teachers and administrators was well documented. Many studies had shown that most teachers could do a better job if they were given more practical information about the teaching process itself and about how to implement the theories that they learned. Studies had also shown that administrative personnel could do more to help teachers improve their instructional skills if they had a better understanding of the components of effective teaching.

Achievement test scores of Arkansas students reflected the need for better teaching techniques. A large number of the Arkansas school age population were scoring below the national norms in all basic skills and low achievement scores were a persistent trend throughout the nation.

Dr. Roberts sent a small group of Arkansas educators to participate in a pilot program of PET training in Newport News. The training session consisted of instructional input sessions plus practice sessions in which the concepts and strategies were put into application by the participants.

The Program for Effective Teaching model recognized the individuality, needs, style, and interest of the teacher and focused on providing the teacher with tools and techniques to use in planning for effective instruction

as he utilized his own teaching style in the presentation of instruction. PET is the science of teaching, while the teacher's style is the art of teaching.

The Program for Effective Teaching is based on a model which describes the total teaching act as being composed of six components:

1. Knowledge of content;
2. Planning skills;
3. Selection and use of appropriate materials;
4. Classroom management;
5. Human relations skills;
6. Instructional skills based on knowledge and understanding of human growth and development.

Although the six components are interrelated and interdependent, the content of the PET training program focused primarily on the instructional skills component. The instructional skills included:

1. Select the objective at the appropriate level of difficulty;
2. Teach to the objective;
3. Maintain the focus of the learner on the learning;
4. Use without abuse the principles of learning (motivation, reinforcement, retention, and transfer);
5. Monitor and adjust the teaching/learning.

Techniques and theory relative to these skills were addressed in the training program sessions. In addition to presentations on the five instructional skills, the participants learned to plan a lesson using the steps of task analysis, to increase the student's thinking skills using Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Bloom, 1956), and to outline a lesson using the PET lesson line developed by Bill Etheridge.

The lesson line which established the elements of the instructional presentation included:

1. Anticipatory set - stating the objective, involving the learners, relating the learning to past and/or future learning;

2. Teach to the objective - explanation, questions, responding to the efforts of the learner in terms of the learning, and activities;

3. Closure - involving the learners and summarizing the learning.

Participants in the training program not only received instructional input on the content of the training program, but also practiced the techniques, viewed teaching demonstrations, and applied the PET techniques and concepts in a teach/observation/conference session. In this session the participants and observer conference concerning the lesson relative to the effective teaching model.

Persons attending the training completed three cycles of PET training as well as special seminar sessions with UCLA consultants to perfect skills and refine the training outline. After intensive training, this group of Arkansas educators assumed trainer roles and led other groups of Arkansas teachers and administrators through the effective training program. The administrator and teacher training effort in Arkansas was initiated in October, 1979, with the aid of a grant for $106,400 from the Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation. The overall purpose of the grant was to field test a staff development and instructional model which would impact (1) the skills of teachers in grades K-12, (2) the teacher training skills of college professors; and (3) the supervisory skills of school district administrators and Arkansas State Department of Education personnel.

The initial project involved approximately 24 persons including teachers, administrators, Department of Education staff, and faculty members

from institutions of higher education. The school districts were (1) Conway, (2) Crossett, (3) El Dorado, (4) Fayetteville, (5) Hot Springs, (6) Jonesboro, (7) North Little Rock, (8) Pine Bluff, and (9) Texarkana. The first group of trainees were asked to serve as a core or pilot group to encourage the expansion of the PET program in their own and other school districts, with some of them serving as trainers of new groups to create a rippling effect throughout the state. After the first group of 24 were trained in a 25-day instructional cycle two new groups were identified. Four assistant trainers from the original group helped the two primary trainers conduct the second 25-day instructional cycle. After this cycle, the assistant trainers were ready to become primary trainers, thus increasing the number of skilled trainers each time the training was offered.

The training was then expanded to include four new groups of 24, again utilizing assistant trainers to assist the primary trainers to assist the primary trainers, with four additional groups being trained in the next 25-day cycle. This type of multiplier effect helped ensure that the program continued to have an impact on education in Arkansas after the one-year funding period. Approximate 225 educators throughout the state of Arkansas were involved in the initial one year pilot program.

Master PET consultants from California and Virginia worked closely with trainees in the Arkansas Department of Education, institutions of higher education and pilot school districts. These consultants helped coordinate the training efforts and provided ongoing support to help ensure the staff development/clinical supervision program was implemented as planned.

The purpose of the field-test was to determine if the PET model could be used to improve the instructional skills of teachers in grade K-12, to improve teacher training programs in institutions of higher education, and to improve the supervisory skills of school district administrators and Arkansas

Department of Education personnel. The Department of Education reported at the end of the first year that the actual outcome of the pilot program had far exceeded the expected outcome. After the first twelve months of field- testing the PET program had expanded to include 3,211 educators.

This was the first time the state attempted to coordinate educational resources at the different levels in such a comprehensive staff development/clinical supervision program.

The proposed cooperative strategy was designed to strengthen statewide staff development/clinical supervision by providing (1) a common framework for moving toward effective and efficient teaching; (2) a means of communicating through the use of common terminology; and (3) a training strategy which emphasizes the critical elements involved in instruction at any level.

Dr. Roberts felt the benefits in improved pre-service and inservice training were significant for local education agencies, for colleges and universities, and for the Arkansas Department of Education personnel. He felt that with the implementation of PET Arkansas educators would asked themselves what effective teachers were doing that separated them from less effective teachers.

It could be concluded that the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) had a positive impact on educators throughout the State of Arkansas. The PET program has provided educators with a means of communicating through the use of common terminology and with a basic essential framework for moving toward more effective and efficient teaching. The PET program has spread at a very rapid rate throughout the state. Thousands of dollars from local and federal funds have been expended to train teachers and administrators in the PET program.

As a result of the PET program, educators in Arkansas now have a common language for communicating about the teaching/learning process. Such a common language provides educators with a means to analyze the teaching/learning process and to articulate more precisely those aspects of instruction that hopefully leads directly to increased student achievement.

Outline for PET Content

Instructional Day 1

I. Introduction/Explanation of Schedule
   - A. Input
   - B. Practice
   - C. Observation
   - D. Conference

II. Overview-Program for Effective Teaching
   - A. Program Goals
     1. Effective of learning
     2. Efficiency of time
     3. Common language
   - B. Arts vs. Science of Teaching
     1. The Teacher decision-making
     2. Teacher control of teaching behavior
   - C. Background
   - D. Total Teaching Act
     1. Classroom management skills
     2. Human relations skills
     3. Planning skills
     4. Selection and use of appropriate materials
     5. Knowledge of content
     6. Instructional skills
   - E. Instructional Skills
     1. Purpose of focus on instructional skills
     2. Names of five instructional skills
        - a. Select an objective at the appropriate level
        - b. Teach to the overview
        - c. Maintain the focus of the learner on the learning
        - d. Monitor and adjust
        - e. Use without abuse principles of learning
          - (1) Motivation
          - (2) Reinforcement
          - (3) Retention
          - (4) Transfer

III. Select an objective at the appropriate level
- A. Task analysis (learning)
  - 1. Definition
  - 2. Steps of task analysis
    - a. Identify a terminal objective
    - b. Brainstorm for all possible enroute learnings
    - c. Weed out nonessentials
    - d. Sequence if necessary
    - e. Form diagnostic questions
- B. Diagnostic survey

<u>Instructional Day 2</u>

Review/Feedback

I. Teach to the objective
- A. Definition of T20
- B. Effective, efficient, relevance
- C. Focus components of T20
  - 1. Explanation
    - a. Content
    - b. Process
    - c. Example
    - d. Definition
    - e. Models
    - f. Modeling
  - 2. Questioning
    - a. Purpose
    - b. Types
      - (1) Guided
      - (2) Independent
  - 3. Responding to the efforts of the learner in terms of learning
    - a. Purpose
    - b. Frequency
  - 4. Activity
    - a. Purpose
    - b. Types
      - (1) Guided
      -)2) Independent

Demonstration lesson
Conference
Practice/observation/conference

Instructional Day 3

Review/feedback from observation

I. Maintain the focus of learner on the learning
   A. Definition of maintaining the focus of learner on the learning
   B. Components
      1. Anticipatory set
         a. Purpose
         b. Elements
            (1) Statement of learning
            (2) Involvement of the learner
            (3) Relation of the learning to a past, present or future learning or experience of the learner
      2. Closure
         a. Purpose
         b. Elements
            (1) Summary of the learning
            (2) Involvement of the learner
      3. Active participation
         a. Purpose
         b. Types
            (1) Covert behavior
            (2) Overt behavior

Demonstration lesson
Practice/observation/conference

Instructional Day 4

Review/feedback from observation

I. Bloom's taxonomy
   A. Origin of taxonomy
   B. Definition of taxonomy
   C. Purpose
   D. Levels of thinking
      1. Knowledge
      2. Comprehension
      3. Application
      4. Analysis
      5. Synthesis
      6. Evaluation
   E. Difficulty and complexity

Demonstration lesson

Practice/observation/conference

Instructional Day 5

Review/feedback from observation

I. Use without abuse principles of learning
  A. Definition/identification of four principles
  B. Motivation
    1. Definition
    2. Variables
      a. Interest
      b. Level of concern/tension
      c. Feeling tone
      d. Success/level of difficulty
      e. Reward
      f. Specific knowledge of results
  C. Reinforcement
    1. Definition
    2. Concepts of reinforcement
      a. Methods
        (1) Positive
        (2) Negative
        (3) Extinction
      b. Schedule
        (1) Regular
        (2) Intermittent

Demonstration lesson
Practice/observation/conference

Instructional Day 6

Review/feedback

I. Use without abuse principles of learning
  A. Retention
    1. Definition
    2. Variables
      a. Meaning
      b. Practice
        (1) How much
        (2) How long
        (3) How often
          (a) Masses
          (b) Distributed
      c. Modeling

d. Feeling tone
e. Transfer
f. Degree of original learning

B. Transfer
1. Definition
2. Types
a. Positive
b. Negative
3. Variables
a. Similarity
b. Association
c. Degree of original learning
d. Identification of critical attribute

Demonstration lesson
Conference
Practice/observation/conference

Instructional Day 7

I. Monitor and adjust
A. Definition
B. Purpose
C. Steps
1. Generate overt behavior
2. Observe overt behavior
3. Interpret overt behavior
4. Determine the need for adjustment or no adjustment
5. Take action

II. Program Closure
III. Program Evaluation

Practice/observation/conference

METHODOLOGY

The sample for the study consisted of the entire population of public school principals in Arkansas who had completed PET training. To ensure the survey would be sent to each public school principal in the state the Arkansas Association of Educational Administrators provided a current mailing list of every public school in Arkansas. Also, to ensure the survey was completed only by principals that had completed PET training or that use PET in their public school, a cover letter with the options of (1) have not completed a PET cycle, OR (2) My building/district does not use PET was enclosed in addition to the survey.

One thousand and sixty-seven surveys were mailed to Arkansas public school principals. Four-hundred and fifty-nine usable surveys were returned. Thirty cover letters were returned indicating the principal had not had PET training or did not use PET in their district or building. Item No. 35 requested the respondents to indicate which of the fifteen Educational Service Cooperatives their particular school feeds in to, therefore the study should reveal some regional geographical information.

Instrumentation

The original PRINPET survey instrument was designed by Dr. Alice S. Sheehan during her doctoral studies at South Carolina State University. Dr. Sheehan granted written permission for the replication of her study. She also granted permission for modification of PRINPET survey items. In order to establish content validity of the original PRINPET survey, Dr. Alice S. Sheehan

distributed the original survey to ten experts in PET throughout the state of South Carolina. Dr. Sheehan stated that these persons are PET trainers and possessed a theoretical as well as a working knowledge of the PET model. Dr. Sheehan made minor modifications to the original instrument based on the feedback from these ten experts.

Dr. Sheehan field tested the revised PRINPET instrument using twenty principals located in schools throughout South Carolina. The analysis of the field test data provided preliminary reliability estimates for the instrument. A reliability coefficient was derived using the split-half method. The Spearman - Bowman formula was utilized to determine the reliability of the entire instrument. The corrected reliability coefficient was .80.

With the permission of Dr. Sheehan some of the twenty-four PRINPET survey items were modified by primarily rewording them without changing the context of the content to acquire the same information as the original survey instrument.

With the assistance of Dr. James T. Bolding and Dr. George S. Denny nine additional items were designed to acquire specific information concerning principals' attitudes towards the effect PET had on student achievement test scores, teacher evaluation and dismissal, district teacher evaluation instruments, teacher's attitudes toward PET, teachers use of PET in the classroom, and the quality of training provided by Arkansas Educational Service Cooperatives.

The revised PRINPET instrument was distributed to fifteen competent educators in northwest Arkansas (teachers, principals, assistant superintendents, superintendents, college professors, and educational service cooperative personnel) that are PET trained. All fifteen survey instruments with suggestions were returned and minor modifications were made primarily to

word meaning which did not affect the content. The number ranking order for the revised PRINPET survey instrument was reversed with 1 indicating strongly disagree, 2 indicating disagree, 3 indicating agree and 4 indicating strongly agree. The survey items were divided into positive and negative statements. Principals were requested to record their perceptions (attitude) of the specific elements addressed in each item. The survey instrument addressed the following items:

Attitudes of principals toward PET: (ATTITUDE)

(Part 1: Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28).

Perceived enhancement of supervisory skills: (ENHANCE)

(Part 1: Items 3, 9, 16)

Quality of training received: (QUALITY)

(Part 1: Items 7, 8, 29)

Maintenance/ coaching : (COACHING)

(Part 1: Items 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20. 21)

The second part of the survey was designed with the assistance of Dr. James T. Bolding and Dr. George S. Denny. The specific components of the PET Total Teaching Act required a value rating with 0 indicating no value to teachers to 4 indicating very valuable to teachers.

Likewise, the specific components of the PET Instructional Skills required the same value rating. The last section of Part 2 required the same value ranking on the components concerning PET training.

In addition, information was requested as to whether PET training was mandatory in their school district and the total number of faculty/staff currently PET trained in the principal's building.

Information was requested as to where the principal received their PET training, the number of PET training cycles the principal had completed and the particular Educational Service Cooperative the principal's school feeds in to.

The instrument contained in addition to the thirty-seven items the following subject data:

38. Sex : Male, Female
39. Race : Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, Other
40. Age category : 20-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40, 41-45, 46-50, 51-55, 56 +
41. Total years in education: 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36 +
42. Education : Bachelors, Masters, Specialist, Doctorate
43. School Type : Elementary, Middle, Junior, High, Vocational
44. Building grade levels served :
45. Current building enrollment:

In addition, the survey provided ample space for comments.

Data Collection

The first step in data collection was securing a current mailing list of all public school principals in Arkansas. A current list was supplied by the Arkansas Association of Educational Administrators. Each principal was mailed a cover letter from the Arkansas School Study Council which provided an explanation for the purpose of the study, a survey instrument and a pre - addressed stamped envelope. It was decided that in order for principals to remain anonymous, coding of the surveys would be inappropriate, and the only code would be demographic information concerning the Educational Service Cooperative that serves each individual principal.

One thousand and sixty-seven surveys were mailed. Four - hundred and fifty-nine surveys were returned (43%). Thirty cover letters were returned indicating the principal had not been PET trained or that their building/district did not use PET.

Statistical Analysis and Procedures

The data for this study were analyzed using the Statistics With Finesse (Bolding, 1992). Descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, mode, median, and standard deviation) were computed to facilitate the descriptive analysis of the data. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures and chi-square procedures were used to test the null hypotheses. The hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of probability

FINDINGS

The following data will give the major findings of the study. The purpose of the study was to determine attitudes of school principals toward various aspects of the Program for Effective Teaching.

In this study, data were obtained to test four hypotheses. Stated in the null, they are as follows:

Ho: 1. There is no significant difference in the attitudes of elementary and secondary principals toward the Program for Effective Teaching.

Ho: 2. There is no significant difference in the perceived enhancement of supervisory skills derived from the training of elementary and secondary principals.

Ho: 3. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary and secondary principals toward the quality of training in the PET program.

Ho: 4. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of elementary and secondary principals in the maintenance (coaching) aspect of the Program for Effective Teaching.

Descriptive Findings

In the sample, approximately 67% of the respondents were male. The majority, (89.5%, 409) of the principals were Caucasian. Concerning age, the majority, (78.5%, 359) of the principals were over the age of 41. The highest earned degree possessed by a majority, (69.0%, 316) of the respondents was a masters degree, and approximately half of the respondents had between 16 and 25 years experience in the field of education. More than half of the respondents (62.5%, 287) were elementary principals and (40.9%, 183) of the total group had completed at least two cycles of PET to become a certified observer. Table 1 displays the frequencies and percentages of elementary and secondary principal participation.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Administrator Participation

By Gender*		Frequency	Percentage
Total Group	Male	308	67.1
	Female	151	32.9
Elementary	Male	144	50.2
	Female	143	49.8
Secondary	Male	164	95.3
	Female	8	4.7

*10 principals did not respond.

By Ethnicity*		Frequency	Percentage
Total Group	Caucasian	409	89.5
	African-American	46	10.1
	Hispanic	0	0
	Other	2	0.4

Table 1 (continued)

Elementary	Caucasian	255	88.9
	African-American	32	11.1
	Hispanic	0	0
	Other	0	0
Secondary	Caucasian	154	90.6
	African-American	14	8.2
	Hispanic	0	0
	Other	2	1.2

*12 principals did not respond.

By Age*		Frequency	Percentage
Total Group	20-25	0	0
	26-30	6	1.3
	31-35	31	6.8
	36-40	61	13.3
	41-45	124	27.1
	46-50	104	22.8
	51-55	76	16.6
	56+	55	12.0
Elementary	20-25	0	0
	26-30	2	0.7
	31-35	19	6.6
	36-40	40	14.0
	41-45	76	26.6
	46-50	62	21.7
	51-55	48	16.8
	56+	39	13.6
Secondary	20-25	0	0
	26-30	4	2.3
	31-35	12	7.0
	36-40	21	12.3
	41-45	48	28.1
	46-50	42	24.6
	51-55	28	16.4
	56+	16	9.4

*18 Principals did not respond.

Table 1 (continued)

By Highest Degree Earned*		Frequency	Percentage
Total Group	Bachelors	2	0.4
	Masters	316	69.0
	Specialist	119	26.0
	Doctorate	21	4.6
Elementary	Bachelors	1	0.3
	Masters	210	73.4
	Specialist	64	22.4
	Doctorate	11	3.8
Secondary	Bachelors	1	0.6
	Masters	106	61.6
	Specialist	55	32.0
	Doctorate	10	5.8

* 11 principals did not respond.

By Years in Education*		Frequency	Percentage
Total Group	1-5	5	1.1
	6-10	20	4.4
	11-15	69	15.1
	16-20	105	23.0
	21-25	119	26.1
	26-30	86	18.9
	31-35	37	8.1
	36+	15	3.3
Elementary	1-5	2	0.7
	6-10	13	4.6
	11-15	46	16.2
	16-20	61	21.5
	21-25	74	26.1
	26-30	57	20.1
	31-35	22	7.7
	36+	9	3.2

Table 1 (continued)

Secondary	1-5	3	1.7
	6-10	7	4.1
	11-15	23	13.4
	16-20	44	25.6
	21-25	45	26.2
	26-30	39	16.9
	31-35	15	18.7
	36+	6	3.5

* 13 principals did not respond.

By Type of School*	Frequency	Percentage
Elementary	287	62.5
Secondary	172	37.5

* 10 principals did not respond.

By Cycles of PET Completed*		Frequency	Percentage
Total Group	Zero	4	0.9
	One	54	12.1
	Two	183	40.9
	Three	156	34.9
	Four	29	6.5
	Five	21	4.7
Elementary	Zero	2	0.7
	One	23	8.3
	Two	114	41.2
	Three	100	36.1
	Four	22	7.9
	Five	16	5.8
Secondary	Zero	2	1.2
	One	31	18.2
	Two	69	18.2
	Three	56	32.9
	Four	7	4.1
	Five	5	2.9

* 22 principals did not respond.

The items on the survey referring to ATTITUDE were Part 1: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28. On negatively stated items, the scale values were inversed for interpretive consistency. That is, higher values on the scale of each negatively stated item were made consistent with more negatively stated items.

Roughly, eight out of ten of the administrators who responded, (89.11%, 409) favored mandatory PET training for every teacher. In addition, nearly all of the principals who responded (96.08%, 441) disagreed with the idea that PET training was a waste of time. Furthermore, over one-half (66.67%, 306) of the respondents agreed that PET had improved administrators' morale. Additionally, four out of five principals who responded (88.67%, 407) agreed that all administrators should complete PET training. Over 85% of the principals who responded (87.37%, 401) disagreed with the notion that they did not learn anything new in PET, and that PET coaching techniques would not work with teachers in their schools (90.85%, 417), or that PET required too much time for the benefits gained (84.31, 387). However, over half (56.65%, 260) who responded disagreed that PET training was the best staff development program they had ever attended. On the contrary, eight out of ten (85.4%, 392) principals agreed that PET is an effective tool for evaluating certified personnel, and eight out of ten (84.1%, 386) responded their teacher evaluation instrument is based on PET terminology.

Moreover, a majority of the principals who responded (69.94%, 321) agreed that additional PET training would be beneficial to them. Also, a majority of the principals (67.38%, 316) responded that PET training was mandatory for the teachers in their school district, and approximately six out of ten principals, (69.50%, 319) disagreed with the notion that the PET program

was controversial with their teachers. Descriptive statistics for a majority of the survey statements revealed a positive attitude on the part of all 459 respondents. Tables 2-4 display data dealing directly with the respondents attitudes toward PET. Table 2 displays the response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Public School Principals (N=459) to the items of the Principal Attitude Survey subscale of the ATTITUDE of principals toward PET.

Table 2

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Public School Principals to the Items of ATTITUDE Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	All Principals (N=459)			
1. PET training should be required for every teacher.	1.74 (n=8)	8.50 (n=39)	37.91 (n=174)	51.20 (n=235)
2. PET training has improved how other perceive me	2.61 (n=12)	19.61 (n=90)	57.72 (n=264)	17.65 (n=81)
a4. PET training is a waste of time.	67.54 (n=310)	28.54 (n=131)	2.18 (n=10)	0.87 (n=4)
5. PET training has improved administrative morale.	3.49 (n=16)	26.36 (n=121)	55.99 (n=257)	10.68 (=49)
6. PET training should be required for every Arkansas principal.	2.18 (n=10)	26.36 (=38)	41.39 (n=190)	47.28 (n=217)
a10. PET training did not teach me anything new.	40.31 (n=185)	47.06 (n=216)	10.46 (n=48)	1.53 (n=7)
a11. PET coaching techniques are not effective with my teachers.	33.55 (n=154)	57.30 (n=263)	6.97 (n=32)	1.09 (n=7)
a12. PET training requires too much time for the benefits.	33.33 (n=153)	50.98 (n=234)	11.11 (n=51)	3.27 (n=6)
13. PET training has resulted in higher test scores.	3.27 (n=15)	30.28 (n=139)	49.67 (n=228)	3.49 (n=16)

Table 2 (continued)

22. PET improved my teachers' morale	4.58 (n=21)	34.42 (n=158)	48.80 (n=224)	5.01 (n=23)
23. PET is an effective tool for evaluating certified personnel.	2.61 (n=12)	10.24 (n=47)	62.09 (n=285)	23.31 (n=107)
24. My teachers have a good attitude about PET.	3.70 (n=17)	24.18 (n=111)	62.31 (n=286)	8.50 (n=6)
25. PET is the best staff development program I ever attended.	11.33 (n=52)	45.32 (n=208)	32.46 (n=149)	8.28 (n=38)
a26. PET program is controversial with my teachers.	12.42 (n=57)	57.08 (n=262)	26.36 (n=121)	3.05 (n=14)
a.27 PET program is controversial with Arkansas principals.	8.93 (n=41)	56.64 (n=260)	27.45 (n=126)	1.96 (n=9)
28. Our teacher evaluation instrument is based on PET terminology.	1.31 (n=6)	14.16 (n=55)	58.61 (n=269)	25.49 (n=117)

"a" response inversed for interpretive consistency.

Similarly, responses of 287 elementary school principals revealed positive attitudes toward ATTITUDE variables. However, a small majority of the respondents did not feel that PET was the best staff development program they had ever attended. On a scale of 1-4, the mean for the aggregate ATTITUDE was 3.08, and the standard deviation was .445. Response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Elementary Public School Principals (N=287) to the items of the Principal Attitude Survey subscale of the ATTITUDE of principals toward PET are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Elementary Public School Principals to the Items of ATTITUDE Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	Elementary Principals (N=287)			
1. PET training should be required for every teacher.	0.70 (n=2)	6.62 (n=19)	34.15 (n=98)	58.19 (n=167)
2. PET training has improved how other perceive me	1.39 (n=4)	15.68 (n=45)	56.79 (n=163)	23.00 (n=66)
a4. PET training is a waste of time.	73.17 (n=210)	23.69 (n=68)	2.09 (n=6)	0.35 (n=1)
5. PET training has improved administrative morale.	2.79 (n=8)	22.65 (n=65)	56.45 (n=162)	13.59 (n=39)
6. PET training should be required for every Arkansas principal.	0.70 (n=2)	8.01 (n=23)	39.37 (n=113)	51.57 (n=148)
a10. PET training did not teach me anything new.	45.99 (n=132)	41.46 (n=119)	10.45 (n=30)	1.05 (n=3)
a11. PET coaching techniques are not effective with my teachers.	40.07 (n=115)	50.87 (n=146)	6.62 (n=19)	1.05 (n=3)
a12. PET training requires too much time for the benefits.	41.11 (n=118)	44.60 (n=128)	11.50 (n=33)	2.09 (n=3)
13. PET training has resulted in higher test scores.	2.09 (n=6)	24.39 (n=70)	54.70 (n=157)	4.88 (n=14)
22. PET improved my teachers' morale	3.14 (n=9)	30.31 (n=87)	52.26 (n=150)	6.62 (n=19)
23. PET is an effective tool for evaluating certified personnel.	2.44 (n=7)	8.01 (n=23)	58.89 (n=169)	29.27 (n=84)
24. My teachers have a good attitude about PET.	2.09 (n=6)	18.82 (n=54)	66.20 (n=190)	11.85 (n=34)

Table 3 (continued)

25. PET is the best staff development program I ever attended.	9.41 (n=27)	39.72 (n=114)	38.68 (n=111)	9.06 (n=26)
a26. PET program is controversial with my teachers.	16.03 (n=46)	57.14 (n=164)	23.69 (n=68)	1.74 (n=5)
a.27 PET program is controversial with Arkansas principals.	11.15 (n=32)	56.45 (n=162)	24.74 (n=71)	1.39 (n=4)
28. Our teacher evaluation instrument is based on PET terminology.	1.39 (n=4)	12.20 (n=35)	59.58 (n=171)	26.83 (n=77)

"a" response inversed for interpretive consistency.

Responses of 172 secondary school principals revealed positive attitudes toward a majority of the ATTITUDE variables. A majority of the secondary principals disagreed that the PET program had improved teacher morale, resulted in higher test scores, and also did not feel that it was the best staff development program they had ever attended. On a scale of 1-4, the mean aggregate for ATTITUDE was 2.85 and the standard deviation was .450. Table 4 displays the response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals (N=172) to the items of the Principal Attitude Survey subscale of the ATTITUDE of principals toward PET.

Table 4

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals to the Items of ATTITUDE Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	Secondary Principals (N=172)			
1. PET training should be required for every teacher.	3.49 (n=6)	11.63 (n=20)	44.19 (n=76)	39.53 (n=68)
2. PET training has improved how other perceive me	4.65 (n=8)	26.16 (n=45)	58.72 (n=101)	8.72 (n=15)
a4. PET training is a waste of time.	58.14 (n=100)	36.63 (n=63)	2.33 (n=4)	1.74 (n=3)
5. PET training has improved administrative morale.	4.65 (n=8)	32.56 (n=56)	55.23 (n=95)	5.81 (n=10)
6. PET training should be required for every Arkansas principal.	4.65 (n=8)	8.72 (n=15)	44.77 (77)	40.12 (n-69)
a10. PET training did not teach me anything new.	30.81 (n=53)	56.40 (n=97)	10.47 (n=18)	2.33 (n=4)
a11. PET coaching techniques are not effective with my teachers.	22.67 (n=39)	68.02 (n=117)	7.56 (n=13)	1.16 (n=4)
a12. PET training requires too much time for the benefits.	20.35 (n=35)	61.63 (n=106)	10.47 (n=18)	5.23 (n=9)
13. PET training has resulted in higher test scores.	5.23 (n=9)	40.12 (n=69)	41.28 (n=71)	1.16 (n=2)
22. PET improved my teachers' morale	6.98 (n=12)	41.28 (n=71)	43.02 (n=74)	2.33 (n=4)
23. PET is an effective tool for evaluating certified personnel.	2.91 (n=5)	13.95 (n=24)	67.44 (n=116)	13.37 (n=23)
24. My teachers have a good attitude about PET.	6.40 (n=11)	33.14 (n=57)	55.81 (n=96)	2.91 (n=5)
25. PET is the best staff development program I ever attended.	14.53 (n=25)	54.65 (n=94)	22.09 (n=38)	6.98 (n=12)

Table 4 (continued)

a26. PET program is controversial with my teachers.	6.40 (n=11)	56.98 (n=98)	30.81 (n=53)	5.23 (n=9)
a.27 PET program is controversial with Arkansas principals.	5.23 (n=9)	56.98 (n=98)	31.98 (n=55)	2.91 (n=5)
28. Our teacher evaluation instrument is based on PET terminology.	1.16 (n=2)	17.44 (n=30)	56.98 (n=98)	23.26 (n=40)

"a" response inversed for interpretive consistency.

The statements on the survey referring to the ENHANCEMENT of supervisory skills were contained in Part 1: 3, 9, and 16. Almost all principals (94.77%, 435) agreed that PET had improved their skills in observing and coaching teachers. Additionally, nine out of ten (66.08%, 306) of the respondents agreed they were pleased with the additional skills they had acquired from PET. Tables 5-7 display data dealing directly with the enhancement of supervisory skills (ENHANCE). Response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Public School Principals (N=459) to the items of the ENHANCE subscale of the Principal Attitude Survey Instrument are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Public School Principals to the Items of the ENHANCE Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	All Principals (N=459)			
3. PET has improved my skills in observing and coaching teachers.	0.65 (n=3)	4.58 (n=21)	42.70 n=196)	52.07 (n=239)
9. PET training has made me more competent in instructional supervision.	1.09 (n=5)	6.54 (n=30)	54.25 (n=249)	37.47 (n=172)
15. I am pleased with the additional skills I have acquired from PET.	1.09 (n=5)	5.66 (n=26)	66.01 (n=303)	0.65 (n=3)

Similarly, the three items dealing with administrators' perceptions of the enhancement of their supervisory skills, namely Part 1: 3, 9, and 16 (ENHANCE) revealed positive attitudes on the part of elementary school administrators. On a scale of 1-4, the mean for the aggregate ENHANCE was 3.38, and the standard deviation was .519. Response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Elementary School Principals (N=287) to the items of the ENHANCE Subscale of the Principal Attitude Survey Instrument are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Elementary Public School Principals to the Items of ENHANCE Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	Elementary Principals (N=287)			
3. PET has improved my skills in observing and coaching teachers.	0..70 (n=2)	2.44 (n=7)	40.07 n=115	56.79 (n=163)
9. PET training has made me more competent in instructional supervision.	1.05 (n=3)	5.23 (n=15	49.83 (n=143)	43.21 (n=172)
15. I am pleased with the additional skills I have acquired from PET.	0.35 (n=1)	4.53 (n=13)	62.37 (n=179	32.06 (n=92)

The three items dealing with administrators' perception of the enhancement of their supervisory skills; Part 1: 1, 3, and 16 (ENHANCE) revealed strongly positive attitudes on the part of secondary school administrators. On a scale of 1-4, the mean for the aggregate ENHANCE was 3.19, and the standard deviation was .539. Table 7 displays data on the response percentage and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals (N=172) to the items of the ENHANCE subscale of the Principal Attitude Survey Instrument.

Table 7

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals to the Items of ENHANCE Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	Secondary Principals (N=172)			
3. PET has improved my skills in observing and coaching teachers.	0.58 (n=1)	8.14 (n=14)	47.09 n=81)	44.19 (n=76)
9. PET training has made me more competent in instructional supervision.	1.16 (n=2)	8.72 (n=15)	61.63 (n=106)	27.91 (n=48)
15. I am pleased with the additional skills I have acquired from PET.	2.33 (n=4	7.56 (n=13)	72.09 (n=124)	17.44 (n=30)

The items on the survey referring to the QUALITY were contained in Part 1: 7, 8, 9, and 29. Nine out of ten respondents (93.69%, 430) agreed that the training was presented well. Additionally, over 85% of the respondents (85.83%, 394) agreed that the PET trainers modeled the conferencing techniques they wanted them to learn. And seven out of ten (71.02%, 326) revealed they felt their local educational service cooperative had done an effective job of staff development training. Therefore, descriptive statistics for all of the QUALITY statements revealed a positive attitude on the part of all 459 respondents. Tables 8-10 display data dealing directly with the QUALITY subscale of the Principal Attitude Survey Instrument are displayed on Table 8.

Table 8

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Public School Principals to the Items of QUALITY Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	All Principals (N=459)			
7. PET trainers presented the training well.	1.09 (n=5)	4.58 (n=21)	53.38 (n=245)	40.31 (n=185)
8. PET trainers modeled the conferencing techniques.	1.74 (n=8)	11.98 (n=30)	56.69 (n=249)	26.14 (n=172)
29. The Educational Service Cooperative effective does staff development training.	3.27 (n=15)	13.51 (n=62)	55.77 (n=256)	15.25 (n=70)

On the three items pertaining to the QUALITY of the PET program, namely Part 1: 7, 8, and 29 revealed positive attitudes on the part of elementary principals. Nine out of ten (94.77%, 272) elementary principals agreed with the notion that the PET trainers presented the training well, and eight out of ten (86.41%, 246) agreed that the trainers modeled the conferencing techniques they wanted the principals to follow. Six out of ten (68.64%, 197) revealed that their local educational service cooperative did an effective job of staff development training. The mean for the aggregate QUALITY was 3.19, and the standard deviation was .516. Response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Elementary Public School Principals (N=287) to the items of the QUALITY subscale of the Principal Attitude Survey Instrument are displayed on Table 9.

Table 9

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Elementary Public School Principals to the Items of QUALITY Subscale

Item	*Percentage and Frequency of Responses*			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
		Elementary	Principals	(N=287)
7. PET trainers presented the training well.	0.70 (n=2)	3.83 (n=11	51.22 n=147)	43.55 (n=125)
8. PET trainers modeled the conferencing techniques.	0.70 (n=2)	12.20 (n=35)	54.01 (n=155)	32.40 (n=93)
29. The Educational Service Cooperative effective does staff development training.	4.53 (n=13)	10.80 (n=31)	52.61 (n=151)	16.03 (n=46)

In addition, the three items dealing with principals' perceptions of the quality of training (QUALITY), namely Part 1: 7, 8, and 29 revealed a positive attitude on the part of secondary administrators. On a scale of 1-4, the mean for the aggregate QUALITY was 3.05, and the standard deviation was .478. Response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals (N=172) to the items of the QUALITY subscale of the Principal Attitude Survey Instrument are displayed on Table 10.

Table 10

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals to the Items of QUALITY Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	All Principals (N=172)			
7. PET trainers presented the training well.	1.74 (n=3)	5.81 (n=10)	56.98 n=98)	34.88 (n=60)
8. PET trainers modeled the conferencing techniques.	3.49 (n=6)	11.63 (n=20)	69.19 (n=119)	15.70 (n=27)
29. The Educational Service Cooperative effective does staff development training.	1.16 (n=2)	18.02 (n=31)	61.05 (n=105)	13.95 (n=10)

The statements on the survey referring to coaching were Part 1: 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21. Eight out ten (81.70%, 375) of the respondents agreed that all teachers can benefit from coaching. Moreover, almost three out of four principals (75.82%, 348) agreed that all schools should implement a plan whereby skills learned in PET are maintained through coaching. A majority of the respondents (88.89%, 408) revealed their teachers use PET on a regular basis. Accordingly, descriptive statistics for all of the COACH statements revealed positive attitudes toward the coaching aspect of the PET model on the part of all 459 respondents. Tables 11-13 display data dealing directly with the coaching aspect of PET training (COACH). Table 11 displays the response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Public School Principals (N=459) to the items of the COACH subscale of the Principal Attitude Survey Instrument.

Table 11

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Public School Principals to the Items of COACH Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	All Principals (N=459)			
14. PET training review workshops should be required for all faculty each year.	5.23 (n=24)	37.25 (n=171)	42.70 n=196)	13.94 (n=64)
15. PET coaching is beneficial to all teachers.	1.96 (n=9)	15.25 (n=70)	62.75 (n=288)	18.95 (n=87)
17. PET maintenance plans should be implemented in all schools.	2.40 (n=11)	20.26 (n=93)	55.99 (n=257)	19.83 (n=91)
18. Additional PET training would be beneficial to me as an instructional leader.	3.27 (n=15)	25.93 (n=119)	56.21 (n=258)	13.73 (n=63)
19. PET maintenance is implemented in my school.	5.23 (n=24)	40.09 (n=184)	44.23 (n=203)	7.63 (n=35)
20. My teachers use PET on a regular basis.	0.44 (n=2)	10.02 (n=46)	73.64 (n=338)	15.25 (n=70)
21. I conduct PET conferences immediately after observations.	1.09 (n=5)	16.34 (n=75)	57.73 (n=265)	22.88 (n=9)

Moreover, all questions dealing with the coaching aspect, namely Part 1: 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21. (COACH), revealed positive attitudes on the part of 287 elementary administrators toward coaching. Therefore, descriptive findings for all of the COACH statements revealed positive attitudes toward the coaching aspect of the PET model. On a scale of 1-4, the mean for the aggregate COACH was 2.93, and the standard deviation was .434. Response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Elementary

Public School Principals (N=287) to the items of the COACH subscale of the Principal Attitude Survey Instrument are displayed on Table 12.

Table 12

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Elementary Public School Principals to the Items of COACH Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	Elementary Principals (N=287)			
14. PET training review workshops should be required for all faculty each year.	4.53 (n=13)	32.40 (n=93)	45.30 n=130)	16.72 (n=48)
15. PET coaching is beneficial to all teachers.	1.05 (n=3)	13.59 (n=39)	60.63 (n=174)	24.04 (n=2)
17. PET maintenance plans should be implemented in all schools.	1.74 (n=5)	17.07 (n=49)	57.14 (n=164)	23.00 (n=66)
18. Additional PET training would be beneficial to me as an instructional leader.	3.48 (n=10)	26.13 (n=75)	54.70 (n=157)	14.63 (n=42)
19. PET maintenance is implemented in my school.	4.88 (n=14)	35.19 (n=101)	48.78 (n-140	9.06 (n=26)
20. My teachers use PET on a regular basis.	0.35 (n=1)	7.32 (n=21)	74.56 (n=214)	17.77 (n=51
21. I conduct PET conferences immediately after observations.	1.05 (n=3)	14.63 (n=42)	55.05 (n=158)	26.83 (n=77)

Also, a majority of the questions dealing with the coaching aspect namely Part 1: 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 (COACH), revealed a positive attitude on the part of 172 secondary administrators toward coaching. Concerning whether PET review workshops should be required for all faculty each year, approximately one-half (51.75%, 89) disagreed that it was necessary. More than one-half 54.07 (54.07%, 93) of the secondary principals

revealed that a PET maintenance program was not being implemented in their school. On the contrary, six out of ten secondary principals (68.60%, 118) felt that PET maintenance plans should be implemented in all schools. On a scale of 1-4, the mean for the aggregate COACH was 2.75, and the standard deviation was .055. Response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals (N=172) to the items of the COACH subscale of the Principal Attitude Survey Instrument are displayed on Table 13.

Table 13

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals to the Items of COACH Subscale

Item	Percentage and Frequency of Responses			
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	Secondary Principals (N=172)			
14. PET training review workshops should be required for all faculty each year.	6.40 (n=11)	45.35 (n=78)	38.37 (n=66)	9.30 (n=16)
15. PET coaching is beneficial to all teachers.	3.49 (n=6)	18.02 (n=31)	65.28 (n=114)	10.47 (n=18)
17. PET maintenance plans should be implemented in all schools.	3.49 (n=6)	25.58 (n=44)	54.07 (n=93)	14.53 (n=25)
18. Additional PET training would be beneficial to me as an instructional leader.	2.91 (n=5)	25.58 (n=44)	58.72 (n=101)	12.21 (n=21)
19. PET maintenance is implemented in my school.	5.81 (n=10)	48.26 (n=83)	36.63 (n=63)	5.23 (n=9)

Table 13 (continued)

20. My teachers use PET on a regular basis.	0.58 (n=1)	14.53 (n=25	72.09 (n=124)	11.05 (n=3)
21. I conduct PET conferences immediately after observations.	1.16 (n=2)	19.19 (N=33)	62.21 (n=107)	16.28 (n=28)

Comparative Findings

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if there were significant differences between elementary and secondary building principals on the twenty-nine attitudinal items of this study. Under the category of principals' general attitudes towards PET (ATTITUDE), individual responses to statements 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 revealed a significant difference at the .05 level of significance between the two groups. Therefore, Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference in the attitudes of elementary and secondary principals toward the Program for Effective Teaching is rejected.

Similarly, under the category of principals' perceptions of whether PET had enhanced their supervisory skills (ENHANCE), responses revealed that there was a significant difference at the .05 level of significance between the two groups concerning whether skills in observing and coaching teachers had been improved. In addition, significant differences were found between the two groups on whether principals felt more competent in instructional supervision because they completed one or more cycles of PET. Furthermore, responses revealed that there were significant differences between both groups as to whether they were pleased with the additional skills they had acquired from PET. Therefore, Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference in the perceived enhancement of supervisory skills derived from the training of elementary and secondary principals is rejected.

In the category of items that related to the quality of the training (QUALITY), responses revealed a significant difference at the .05 level of significance between the groups on the quality of the training. Therefore, Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary and secondary principals toward the quality of training in the PET Program is rejected.

The maintenance or coaching aspect of the PET model (COACH), responses revealed a significant difference at the .05 level of significance in the two groups toward whether all teachers might benefit from maintenance /coaching. Therefore, Hypothesis Four: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of elementary and secondary principals in the maintenance (coaching) aspect of the Program for Effective Teaching in their schools is rejected.

Table 14 provides the results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) comparison of itemized and subscale PAS (Principal Attitude Survey Toward PET) means of principals in elementary and secondary schools.

Table 14

Results of One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Comparison of Itemized and Subscale Means of Arkansas Principals in Elementary and Secondary Schools

Item	Group	Mean	F	Sig
ATTITUDE	Elementary Secondary			
1. PET should be required for every teacher.	Elementary Secondary	3.50 3.21	-4.27	.0001*
2. PET has improved how others perceive me.	Elementary Secondary	3.05 2.73	-4.81	.0001*
a4. PET is a waste of time.	Elementary Secondary	1.29 1.47	3.27	.0006*
5. PET has improved administrators' morale.	Elementary Secondary	2.85 2.63	-3.20	.0007*
6. PET should be required for all principals.	Elementary Secondary	3.42 3.22	-2.84	.0024*
a10. PET did not teach me anything new.	Elementary Secondary	1.66 1.84	2.67	.0040*
a11. PET coach techniques are not effective with my teachers.	Elementary Secondary	1.68 1.87	3.15	.0009*
a.12. PET requires too much time for the benefits gained.	Elementary Secondary	1.74 2.01	3.65	.0001*
13. PET has resulted in higher test scores.	Elementary Secondary	2.68 2.43	-3.64	.0001*
22. PET has improved my teachers' morale.	Elementary Secondary	2.68 2.43	-3.64	.0002*
23. PET is an effective tool for evaluating certified personnel.	Elementary Secondary	3.17 2.93	-3.62	.0002*
24. My teachers have a good attitude about PET.	Elementary Secondary	2.89 2.22	-5.27	.0001*
25. PET is the best staff development program I ever attended.	Elementary Secondary	2.49 2.22	-3.50	.0003*

Table 14 (continued)

a26. PET program is controversial with my teachers.	Elementary Secondary	2.11 2.35	3.61	.0002*
a.27. PET program is controversial with Arkansas principals.	Elementary Secondary	2.17 2.34	2.56	.0054*
28. Our teacher evaluation instrument is based on PET terminology.	Elementary Secondary	3.12 3.04	-1.29	.0988
ENHANCE	**Elementary Secondary**			
3. PET has improved my skills in observing and coaching teachers	Elementary Secondary	3.53 3.35	-3.07	.0011*
9. PET training has made me more competent in instructional supervision.	Elementary Secondary	3.36 3.17	-3.15	.0009*
16. I am pleased with the additional skills I have acquired from PET.	Elementary Secondary	3.27 3.05	-3.96	.0001*
QUALITY	**Elementary Secondary**			
8. PET trainers modeled the conferencing techniques.	Elementary Secondary	3.19 2.97	-3.44	0003*
29. The Educational Service Cooperative effectively does staff development training.	Elementary Secondary	2.95 2.93	-0.32	3755
COACH	**Elementary Secondary**			
14. PET training review workshops should be required for all faculty each year.	Elementary Secondary	2.75 2.51	-3.22	.0007*
15. PET coaching is beneficial to all teachers.	Elementary Secondary	3.08 2.85	-3.71	.0001*
17. PET maintenance plans should be implemented in all schools.	Elementary Secondary	3.02 2.82	-3.06	.0012*

Table 14 (continued)

18. Additional PET training would be beneficial to me as an instructional leader.	Elementary Secondary	2.81 2.81	-.0.09	.4629
19. PET maintenance is implemented in my school.	Elementary Secondary	2.63 2.43	-2.92	.0018*
20. My teachers use PET on a regular basis.	Elementary Secondary	3.10 2.95	-2.90	.0020*
21. I conduct PET conferences immediately after observations.	Elementary Secondary	3.10 2.95	-2.43	.0077*
ATTITUDE	Elementary Secondary	3.08 2.85	-5.36	.0001*
ENHANCE	Elementary Secondary	3.38 3.19	-3.86	.0001*
QUALITY	Elementary Secondary	3.19 3.05	-2.88	.0021*
COACH	Elementary Secondary	2.92 2.75	-.412	.0001*

95% Confidence Intervals for Population Means of Elementary and Secondary Principals

	Difference Between Sample Means	95% Confidence Interval Difference Between Population Means
ATTITUDE	.2308 +/- .0847 =	(.15 - .31)
ENHANCE	.1959 +/- .1004 =	(.10 - .30)
QUALITY	.1394 +/- .0932 =	(.05 - .23)
COACH	.1730 +/- .0826 =	(.09 - .25)

"a" response inversed for interpretive consistency.
*Significant at the .05 level.

Descriptive and Comparative Findings of Value Ratings of PET Components in Relation to Their Value in The Classroom

The elementary and secondary principals were requested to give a value rating to each subcomponent of the three major components that make up the PET program. The major components are The Total Teaching Act,

Instructional Skills and PET Training. It was felt it would lend credence to this study to obtain a value rating on each subcomponent in relation to its value in the classroom.

The Hunter model is founded on the premise and taught by PET trainers that the subcomponents of The Total Teaching Act, Instructional Skills and PET Training all have equal value.

The subcomponents of The Total Teaching Act are (a) Knowledge Of Content, (b) Planning Skills, (c) Selecting The Appropriate Materials, (d) Classroom Management, (e) Human Relations, (f) Instructional Skills, and (g) Knowledge Of Human Growth And Development.

The subcomponents of the Instructional Skills are (a) Selecting the Objective, (b) Teaching the Objective, (c) Maintaining the Focus, (d) Monitoring and Adjusting, and (e) Principles of Learning.

Concerning the PET Training component the subcomponents are (a) Content of The PET Model, (b) Analysis of The Lesson, (c) Practice Lessons, and (d) Coaching by Principal.

Principals were requested to rate each subcomponent from 0 for no value to 4 for very valuable to the teacher. Concerning the subcomponents of The Total Teaching Act, the elementary principals ranked the subcomponent Instructional Skills as very valuable (66.55%, 191) while the secondary principals ranked the subcomponents Planning Skills and Classroom Management each as equally very valuable (48.26%, 83). It is interesting that the secondary principals also gave equal ratings to Knowledge of Content and Instructional Skills as very valuable (47.67%, 82). Overall, the majority of the principals ranked the seven subcomponents of the Total Teaching Act in the 3 and 4 category indicating the subcomponents were valuable to very valuable in the classroom.

It is also interesting to note the majority of elementary principals (N=287) consistently ranked all seven subcomponents in the very valuable category, while secondary principals (N=172) ranked three of the subcomponents somewhat less than very valuable.

Tables 15-17 displays data on the response percentage and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Public School Principals; all principals (N=459), elementary principals (N=287), and secondary principals (N=172) to the subcomponents of the Total Teaching Act.

Table 15

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Public School Principals to the Items of the Total Teaching Act

Total Teaching Act	Percentage and Frequency of Responses				
Item 30.	No Value 0	1	2	3	Very Valuable 4
	All Principals (N=459)				
a. Knowledge of Content	1.09 (n=5)	2.40 (n=11)	9.80 (n=45)	32.68 (n=150)	54.03 (n=248)
b. Planning Skills	0.0 (n=0)	0.44 (n=2)	6.10 (n=28)	38.13 (n=175)	55.12 (n=253)
c. Selecting Appropriate Materials	0.22 (n=1)	1.74 (n=8)	9.80 (n=45)	43.57 (n=200)	44.66 (n=205)
d. Classroom Management	0.87 (n=4)	2.61 (n=12)	9.15 (n=42)	31.81 (n=146)	55.34 (n=254)
e. Human Relations	1.31 (n=6)	3.70 (n=17)	15.47 (n=71)	38.56 (n=177)	40.52 (n=186)
f. Instruction Skills	0.22 (n=1)	1.09 (N=5)	4.14 (n=19)	34.64 (n=159)	59.48 (n=273)
g. Knowledge of Human Growth Development	0.87 (n=4)	6.32 (n=29)	19.83 (n=91)	40.09 (n=184)	32.24 (n=148)

Table 16

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Elementary Public School Principals to the Items of the Total Teaching Act

Total Teaching Act	Percentage and Frequency of Responses				
Item 30.	No Value 0	1	2	3	Very Valuable 4
	Elementary Principals (N=287)				
a. Knowledge of Content	0.70 (n=2)	1.39 (n=4)	7.67 (n=22)	32.40 (n=93)	57.84 (n=166)
b. Planning Skills	0.0 (n=0)	0.35 (n=1)	6.62 (n=19)	33.80 (n=97)	59.23 (n=170)
c. Selecting Appropriate Materials	0.35 (n=1)	1.39 (n=4)	8.71 (n=25)	39.02 (n=112)	50.52 (n=145)
d. Classroom Management	1.39 (n=4)	2.09 (n=6)	6.97 (n=20)	29.62 (n=85)	59.58 (n=171)
e. Human Relations	1.39 (n=4)	3.83 (n=11)	10.10 (n=29)	36.24 (n=104)	48.08 (n=138)
f. Instruction Skills	0.35 (n=1)	0.70 (n=2)	3.14 (n=9)	28.92 (n=83)	66.55 (n=191)
g. Knowledge of Human Growth Development	1.39 (n=4)	5.57 (n=16)	11.85 (n=34)	39.72 (n=114)	40.77 (n=117)

Table 17

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals to the Items of the Total Teaching Act

Total Teaching Act	Percentage and Frequency of Responses				
Item 30.	No Value 0	1	2	3	Very Valuable 4
	Secondary Principals (N=172)				
a. Knowledge of Content	1.74 (n=3)	4.07 (n=7)	13.37 (n=23)	33.14 (n=57)	47.67 (n=82)
b. Planning Skills	0.0 (n=0)	0.57 (n=1)	5.23 (n=9)	43.35 (n=78)	48.26 (n=83)
c. Selecting Appropriate Materials	0.0 (n=0)	2.33 (n=4)	11.63 (n=20)	51.16 (n=88)	34.88 (n=60)
d. Classroom Management	0.0 (n=0)	3.49 (n=6)	12.79 (n=22)	35.47 (n=61)	48.26 (n=83)
e. Human Relations	1.16 (n=2)	3.49 (n=6)	24.42 (n=42)	42.44 (n=73)	27.91 (n=48)
f. Instruction Skills	0.0 (n=0)	1.74 (n=3)	5.81 (n=10)	44.17 (n=76)	47.67 (n=82)
g. Knowledge of Human Growth Development	0.0 (n=0)	7.56 (n=13)	33.14 (n=57)	40.70 (n=70)	18.02 (n=31)

Concerning the subcomponents of Instructional Skills the total group of principals (N=459) asserted that the subcomponent Teaching to the Objective ranked first as very valuable (61.87%, 284). The elementary principals (N=287) contends that Maintaining the Learner's Focus ranked second as very valuable (63.41%, 182). However, it should be recognized that the secondary principals (N=172) were equally divided between Maintaining the Learner's Focus (40.70%, 70) and Monitoring and Adjusting (40.70%, 70) as the second most valuable subcomponent. It is also interesting to note that both elementary and secondary principals ranked the Principles of Learning as last. Secondary principals rated four subcomponents; (Selecting the Objective,

Maintaining the Learner's Focus, Monitoring and Adjusting, Principles of Learning) all somewhat less than very valuable.

Tables 18 - 20 displays data of the response percentage and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Public School Principals; all principals (N=459), elementary principals (N=287) and secondary principals (N=172) to the subcomponents of Instructional Skills.

Table 18

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Public School Principals to the Items of Instructional Skills

Instructional Skills	Percentage and Frequency of Responses				
Item 31.	No Value 0	1	2	3	Very Valuable 4
	All Principals (N=459)				
a. Selecting Objective	0.44 (n=2)	1.09 (n=5)	10.02 (n=46)	40.09 (n=184)	48.15 (n=221)
b. Teaching Objective	0.0 (n=0)	0.87 (n=4)	3.70 (n=17)	33.55 (n=154)	61.87 (n=284)
c. Maintaining Learner's Focus	0.22 (n=1)	0.44 (n=2)	6.32 (n=29)	38.13 (n=175)	54.90 (n=252)
d. Monitor and Adjusting	0.0 (n=0)	1.09 (n=5)	6.54 (n=30)	41.18 (n=189)	51.20 (n=235)
e. Principles of Learning	0.0 (n=0)	2.61 (n=12)	11.33 (n=52)	46.19 (n=212)	39.87 (n=183)

Table 19

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Elementary Public School Principals to the Items of Instructional Skills

Instructional Skills	Percentage and Frequency of Responses				
Item 31.	No Value 0	1	2	3	Very Valuable 4
	Elementary Principals (N=287)				
a. Selecting Objective	0.35 (n=1)	0.70 (n=2)	7.32 (n=21)	34.84 (n=100)	56.45 (n=162)
b. Teaching Objective	0.0 (n=0)	0.35 (n=1)	3.83 (n=11)	29.27 (n=84)	66.55 (n=191)
c. Maintaining Learner's Focus	0.0 (n=0)	0.35 (n=1)	4.88 (n=14)	31.36 (n=90)	63.41 (n=182)
d. Monitor and Adjusting	0.0 (n=0)	1.05 (n=3)	5.57 (n=16)	35.89 (n=103)	57.49 (n=165)
e. Principles of Learning	0.0 (n=0)	2.44 (n=7)	19.06 (n=26)	42.16 (n=121)	46.34 (n=133)

Table 20

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals to the Items of Instructional Skills

Instructional Skills	Percentage and Frequency of Responses				
Item 31.	No Value 0	1	2	3	Very Valuable 4
	Secondary Principals (N=172)				
a. Selecting Objective	0.58 (n=1)	1.74 (n=3)	14.53 (n=25)	48.84 (n=84)	34.30 (n=59)
b. Teaching Objective	0.0 (n=0)	1.74 (n=3)	3.49 (n=6)	40.70 (n=70)	54.07 (n=93)
c. Maintaining Learner's Focus	0.58 (n=1)	0.58 (n=1)	8.72 (n=15)	49.42 (n=85)	40.70 (n=70)
d. Monitor and Adjusting	0.0 (n=0)	1.16 (n=2)	8.14 (n=14)	50.00 (n=86)	40.70 (n=70)
e. Principles of Learning	0.0 (n=0)	2.91 (n=5)	15.12 (n=26)	52.91 (n=91)	29.07 (n=50)

All four subcomponents of PET Training were consistently given less than very valuable ratings by both elementary principals (N=287) and secondary principals (N=172). It could be assumed that both groups of principals did not endorse the value of PET training components as enthusiastically as they did the subcomponents of the Total Teaching Act and Instructional Skills.

Interesting enough, the subcomponent Coaching by the Principal received the largest percentage by both the elementary principals (47.74%, 137) and secondary principals (58.14%, 100). However, both groups of principals ranked that component as less than very valuable.

It should also be noted that the majority of the total group of principals (74.07%, 340) rated the subcomponent Content of PET Model in categories 2 and 3 giving it a somewhat less than valuable rating. The ratings

on all four of the subcomponents were consistently lower than 4, therefore, giving the indication that principals show less value for these subcomponents than the subcomponents for the Total Teaching Act and Instructional Skills.

Response percentages and frequencies for the sample of Arkansas Public School Principals; all principals (N=459), elementary principals (N=287), secondary principals (N=172) to the subcomponents of PET Training are displayed on Tables 21 - 23.

Table 21

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Public School Principals to the Items of PET Training

PET Training	Percentage and Frequency of Responses				
Item 32.	No Value 0	1	2	3	Very Valuable 4
	All Principals (N=459)				
a. Content of PET model	2.40 (n=11)	5.88 (n=27)	27.23 (n=125)	46.84 (n=215)	35.90 (n=73)
b. Analysis of Lesson	0.65 (n=3)	1.53 (n=7)	15.47 (n=71)	45.10 (n=207)	36.17 (n=166)
c. Practice Lessons	0.44 (n=2)	2.61 (n=12)	13.51 (n=62)	44.66 (n=205)	38.13 (n=175)
d. Coaching by Principal	0.65 (n=3)	1.53 (n=7)	14.16 (n=65)	51.63 (n=237)	31.15 (n=143)

Table 22

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Elementary Public School Principals to the Items of PET Training

PET Training	Percentage and Frequency of Responses				
Item 32.	No Value 0	1	2	3	Very Valuable 4
	Elementary Principals (N=287)				
a. Content of PET model	3.14 (n=9)	5.92 (n=17)	23.00 (n=66)	47.74 (n=135)	18.12 (n=52)
b. Analysis of Lesson	0.70 (n=2)	1.05 (n=3)	12.20 (n=35)	42.51 (n=122)	42.86 (n=123)
c. Practice Lessons	0.35 (n=1)	2.44 (n=7)	8.36 (n=24)	45.30 (n=130)	42.86 (n=123)
d. Coaching by Principal	0.70 (n=2)	1.39 (n=7)	11.50 (n=33)	47.74 (n=137)	37.98 (n=109)

Table 23

Response Percentages and Frequencies for the Sample of Arkansas Secondary Public School Principals to the Items of PET Training

PET Training	Percentage and Frequency of Responses				
Item 32.	No Value 0	1	2	3	Very Valuable 4
	Secondary Principals (N=172)				
a. Content of PET model	1.16 (n=2)	5.81 (n=10)	34.30 (n=59)	45.35 (n=78)	12.21 (n=21)
b. Analysis of Lesson	0.58 (n=1)	2.33 (n=4)	20.93 (n=36)	49.42 (n=85)	25.00 (n=43)
c. Practice Lessons	0.58 (n=1)	2.91 (n=5)	22.09 (n=38)	43.60 (n=75)	30.23 (n=52)
d. Coaching by Principal	0.58 (n=1)	1.74 (n=3)	18.60 (n=32)	58.14 (n=100)	19.77 (n=34)

A t - Test for independent samples was conducted to establish if there were significant differences between elementary (N=287) and secondary (N=172) principals concerning the value of the subcomponents of the Total Teaching Act, Instructional Skills and PET Training. The subcomponents were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Concerning the Total Teaching Act the results established there was a significant difference at the .05 level on every subcomponent with the exception of Planning Skills. The difference in the means on Planning Skills between elementary and secondary principals was 0.1. The subcomponent Knowledge of Human Growth And Development yielded the largest difference in means of 0.44. It could be assumed that both elementary and secondary principals closely concur of the value of teachers planning their lessons according to the techniques taught in the Hunter model.

The subcomponents of the component Instructional Skills were all found to show a significant difference in their value to the teacher. The subcomponent Selecting The Objective yielded the largest difference in the means between elementary and secondary principals with a 0.32 spread and the subcomponent Monitoring and Adjusting yielded the smallest mean difference of 0.2. Therefore, it could be assumed that secondary principals hold less value in all the subcomponents of Instructional Skills than do elementary principals.

With the component of PET Training the Content of the PET Model subcomponent was the only one in which a significant difference was not established at the .05 level. The difference in means between the elementary and secondary principals was 0.11. It could be assumed that both groups of principals feel there is value in the Content Of the PET Model, however differ on

the other three subcomponents of Analysis of the Lesson, Practice Lessons, and Coaching By The Principals as to their value to the classroom teacher.

Table 24 provides the results of the t-Test for Independent Samples comparison of means of value ratings of PET subcomponents of the Total Teaching Act, Instructional Skills and PET Training by Arkansas Elementary and Secondary School Principals.

Table 24

Results of t-Test for Independent Samples of Value Ratings of PET Subcomponents of Arkansas Principals in Elementary and Secondary Schools

Item	Group	Mean	t	Sig.
30. Total Teaching Act	Elementary Secondary			
a. Knowledge of Content	Elementary Secondary	3.45 3.21	-3.04	.0012
b. Planning Skills	Elementary Secondary	3.52 3.42	-1.61	.0540
c. Selecting Appropriate Materials	Elementary Secondary	3.38 3.19	-2.75	.0031*
d. Classroom Management	Elementary Secondary	3.44 3.28	-2.00	.0229*
e. Human Relations	Elementary Secondary	3.26 2.93	-3.87	.0001*
f. Instruction Skills	Elementary Secondary	3.61 3.39	-3.63	.0002*
g. Knowledge of Human Growth Development	Elementary Secondary	3.14 2.70	-5.05	.0001*

Significant at the .05 level.

Table 24 (continued)

Item	Group	Mean	t	Sig.
31. Instructional Skills	Elementary Secondary			
a. Selecting Objective	Elementary Secondary	3.47 3.15	-4.63	.0001*
b. Teaching Objective	Elementary Secondary	3.62 3.47	-2.55	.0056*
c. Maintaining Learner's Focus	Elementary Secondary	3.58 3.29	-4.66	.0001*
d. Monitoring and Adjusting	Elementary Secondary	3.50 3.30	-3.09	.0011*
e. Principles of Learning	Elementary Secondary	3.32 3.08	-3.39	.0004*

* Significant at the .05 level.

Item	Group	Mean	t	Sig
32. PET Training	Elementary Secondary			
a. Content of PET Model	Elementary Secondary	2.73 2.62	-1.26	.1046
b. Analysis of Lesson	Elementary Secondary	3.27 2.98	-3.86	.0001*
c. Practice Lessons	Elementary Secondary	3.29 3.01	-3.71	.0001*
d. Coaching by Principal	Elementary Secondary	3.22 2.99	-3.60	.0002*

*Significant at the .05 level.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there was a significant difference in the attitudes of elementary and secondary building principals toward various aspects of the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) model. Elementary principals were operationally defined as those principals whose schools serviced students in grades K-6. Secondary principals were operationally defined as those principals whose schools serviced students in grades 7-12. Data were obtained to test four hypotheses. Stated in the null, they were as follows:

Ho: 1 There is no significant difference in the attitudes of elementary and secondary principals toward the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) model.

Ho: 2 There is no significant difference in the perceived enhancement of supervisory skills derived from the PET training of elementary and secondary principals.

Ho: 3 There is no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary and secondary principals toward the quality of training in the PET model.

Ho: 4 There is no significant difference between the attitudes of elementary and secondary principals in the maintenance (coaching) aspect of the Program for Effective Teaching model.

In addition, descriptive data were obtained that yielded valuable information concerning the total number of PET cycles completed by each principal, total years in education, highest earned degree, age, gender, and ethnicity.

All statistical comparisons were tested using the .05 level of significance.

Conclusions

Data generated by this study revealed the following:

Ho: 1 There was no significant difference in the attitudes of elementary and secondary principals toward the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) model. This hypothesis is rejected.

Ho: 2 There was no significant difference in the perceived enhancement of supervisory skills derived from the PET training of elementary and secondary principals. This hypothesis was rejected.

Ho: 3 There was no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary and secondary principals toward the quality of training in the PET model. This hypothesis was rejected.

Ho: 4 There was no significant difference between the attitudes of elementary and secondary principals in the maintenance (coaching) aspect of the Program for Effective Teaching model. This hypothesis was rejected.

Based on the data generated by this study secondary principals were consistently somewhat less positive than elementary principals on all four of the major components(Attitude, Enhance, Quality, Maintenance) of the PET model. It should be noted that the sample for this study was somewhat large

(N=459), and statistically, large samples will enable you to reject the hypothesis when the difference between two groups is quite small. Statistically, there was a difference between the two groups on each of the four components, but the differences are not significant. It would be safe to assume the differences were marginal.

Over fifty-six percent (260) of the total group of both elementary and secondary principals stating that PET was not the best staff development program they had attended. This could possibly be an indicator that principals feel there are other staff development programs that are more effective or suitable for teachers. Or it might indicate there is simply a strong negative feeling toward the PET model. In addition, of the total group, approximately one -third (33.55%, 179) of the principals did not think PET training for their teachers had resulted in higher test scores for students. One might conclude that principals do not feel that PET training results in more effective teaching techniques, as one would assume the more effective the teacher, the better the techniques of instruction would be, which hopefully would result in higher student achievement. Moreover, with 39.00%(179) of the principals conveying they did not feel PET had improved teacher morale, it could be assumed that either these principals felt the current status of teacher morale is adequate, or that PET training simply does not result in teachers feeling they are more effective in the classroom.

Secondary principals were less positive on the majority of the individual items of the four major components (Attitude, Enhance, Quality, Maintenance) on the survey instrument. Concerning survey items such as PET being required for every classroom teacher, PET being a waste of time, and PET requiring too much time for the benefits gained the difference between secondary and elementary principals was highly significant. In addition, the

difference between elementary and secondary principals on the survey items concerning teachers having a good attitude about PET and improving teacher's morale was very significant. Furthermore, secondary principals differed significantly with elementary principals on the survey item stating that PET training had resulted in the principal being more competent in instructional supervision, and secondary and elementary principals also differed significantly concerning whether PET coaching is beneficial to all teachers.

Targeting in on the coaching aspect, one could conclude that elementary principals feel much more competent and comfortable using PET coaching techniques with their teachers whereas, it could be assumed secondary principals do not feel comfortable and/or competent with the PET coaching techniques espoused in the PET model.

It is important to note that approximately five out often secondary principals (54.07%, 93) stated that a PET maintenance (coaching) plan is not being implemented in their schools. This would indicate that approximately half of the secondary principals surveyed do not agree with the concept taught during PET training that the principal must serve as the coach to maintain a high level of PET skills development by the teachers.

One could possibly conclude that the two required PET training cycles to achieve observer and coach status is not sufficient to adequately prepare principals to feel competent to serve as a PET coach, and properly monitor PET skills. The second cycle of PET is suppose to lead to the development of competent instructional supervisors. It might be concluded that as PET trainers conduct the second PET cycle for observers and coaches, they are allowing the techniques of the model concerning coaching concepts to become the weak link in the chain. Hunter (1989) contends that classroom observation and feedback–coaching–is an important aspect of model

implementation. She also states that with a wide variety of content and situations, it take approximately two years of practice with coaching to internalize behaviors to proficiency--not coaching two times in two years, which is what seems to have happened. (p. 67).

It is important to note that ongoing staff development for principals is essential to maintain the integrity of any staff development model and also to add new knowledge about ways a principal or coach can influence learning. To be able to achieve this goal, the principal should be adequately trained so that they feel competent and effective in coaching the teacher. Therefore, perhaps the one or two days of coaching instruction during the PET training cycle is not adequate to transform PET workshop information into knowledge, into professional judgment, into wisdom.

It could be assumed that unless a principal is skilled and active in the coaching aspect of the PET model, very little happens in working with the teacher, regardless of how knowledgeable the principal is of PET content. The research in the study supports the need for more sufficient coaching skills for principals so that PET content knowledge is transferred appropriately and artistically, into consistent and informed teaching.

Recommendations

The teach/observation/coach experience provides a framework for clinical supervision of the teacher by the administrator/supervisor. To facilitate the transfer of acquired PET skills, maintain the integrity of the PET model, and periodically add new information, the techniques of the coaching format of the PET model might be reviewed.

Although a majority (81.70%, 375) of the total group of principals agreed that teachers can benefit from coaching, and even a majority of the secondary principals (76.75%, 132)agreed as did the elementary principals

(84.67%, 176) it appears an issue for further study based on the research data might be the actual amount of time the secondary principals are in the classroom observing and coaching as opposed to the elementary principals.

The issue of coaching for instructional improvement is firmly founded in the literature. Since most athletic coaching, training and tutoring is done at the secondary level and the history of school administration shows a large number of secondary principals with athletic backgrounds, who also supervise and evaluate coaches on their staff, an issue of further study might be why secondary principals feel less positive than elementary principals about the observation and coaching aspect of the PET model.

Another item for future study might be research into secondary teachers' perceptions of how often they are observed and coached by their secondary principal, and perceived coaching techniques facilitated by the principal. Concerning the secondary principals' somewhat less than positive attitude about the overall aspects of PET, and the quality of PET training, an additional study could possibly be done on the PET training conducted by the fifteen Arkansas Educational Service Cooperatives. The study could review and/or critique the feedback from principals on the quality of training by the PET trainers with particular emphasis on the component of maintenance (coaching), and review and/or critique the feedback from new teachers going through PET training as to the quality of maintenance (coaching) they are receiving from their building principal between each PET session.

The state of Arkansas has made a strong investment of time and resource in the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) model since its inception in 1979. It is critical that the outcomes of the PET program be analyzed and critiqued to assure that it accomplishes its primary goals which were to establish a common framework for moving toward more effective and efficient

instruction, establish a means of communicating through the use of common terminology and help develop strategies which assist the teacher to emphasize the critical elements involved in instruction at any level.

The principals' attitude is of great importance to the success of any staff development program designed to enhance instructional improvement. For the Program for Effective Teaching model to be completely successful it will be critically important for Arkansas principals to continue to participate in inservice training that will focus on the principal as the instructional leader. Hopefully, as the principals' skills are enhanced in instructional supervision and he/she becomes more aware of how to coach teachers, then teachers will be more likely to take risks required in improving instructional skills. As Arkansas moves into the early 90's, it is hoped the time, resources and effort put forth in the Program for Effective Teaching model will reap positive benefits for both teachers and students in Arkansas classrooms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acheson, K. and Gall, M. (1987). Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers. New York: Longman.

Arkansas Department of Education, Division of Management and Development. (1980). Status Report of the Program for Effective Teaching. Little Rock: State Department of Education.

Bloom, B. (1965). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain. New York: Longman.

Bolding, J. (1987). "Statistics with Finesse." [computer software, revised edition] Fayetteville, AR.

Brandt, R. (1985). "On Teaching and Supervising: A Conversation with Madeline Hunter." Educational Leadership, 42(5).

Campbell, C.., LeOra, C., McBeath, A., and Young, E. (1987). "Implementing Responsive Supervision." The Canadian Administrator, 12(3).

Cogan, M. (1973). Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Cubberley, E. (1922). Public School Administration. New York: Houghton-Mifflin.

Edmonds, R. (1981). "Making Public Schools Effective." Social Policy, 12.

Etheridge, B. (1978). Program for Effective Teaching: A Staff Development Program. Newport News, VA.

Garman, N. and Hazi, H. (1988). "Teachers Ask: Is there Life after Madeline Hunter?" Phi Delta Kappan, 69(9).

Gibboney, R. (1987). "A Critique of Madeline Hunters' Teaching Model from Dewey's Perspective." Educational Leadership, 44(5).

Glatthorn, A. (1984). Differentiated Supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. (1981). Developmental Supervision: Alternative Practices for Helping Teachers Improve Instruction. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. 1st edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R.H., and Krajewski, R.J. (1981). Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. Revised edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Haggerson, N. (1987). Clinical Supervision and Teacher Evaluation Positions of Hunter, Garman and Glickman Interpreted as Literal or Figurative Language. Washington, D.C.: Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association.

Hunter, M. (1973). "Appraising Teaching Performance: One Approach." The National Elementary Principal, 52(6).

Hunter, M. (1973). "Appraising the Instructional Process." Paper presented for CACER/California Advisory Council on Educational Research 25th Annual Conference.

Hunter, M. (1976). Improved Instruction. El Segundo, CA: TIP.

Hunter, M. (1984). "Knowing, Teaching, Supervising." Using What We Know About Teaching. Horsford (editor), Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hunter, M. "Let's Eliminate the Preobservation Conference." Educational Leadership, 43(6).

Hunter, M. (1986). "Madeline Hunter Replies: Develop Collaboration; Build Trust." Educational Leadership, 43(6).

Hunter, M. (1982). Mastery Teaching. El Segundo, CA: TIP.

Hunter, M. (1984). "Pare Down Your Paperwork." The Instructor, 93(5).

Hunter, M. (1983). "Script-Taping: An Essential supervisory Tool." Educational Leadership, 41(3).

Hunter, M. (1980). "Six Types of Supervisory Conferences." Educational Leadership, 37(5).

Hunter, M. (1969). Teach More-Faster. El Segundo, CA: TIP.

Hunter, M. (1979). "Teaching is Decision-Making." Educational Leadership, 37(1).

Hunter, M. (1971). "The Teaching Process." The Teacher's Handbook, El Segundo, CA: TIP.

Hunter, M. (1985). "What's Wrong with Madeline Hunter?" Educational Leadership, 42(5).

Krejewski, R.J. and Anderson, R.H. (1980). "Goldhammer's Clinical Supervision a Decade Later." Educational Leadership, 37.

Krajewski, R.J. (1982). "Clinical Supervision: A Conceptual Framework." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 15(2).

Mandeville, G. and Rivers, J. (1989). "Is the Hunter Model a Recipe for Supervision?" Educational Leadership, 46(8).

McGregor, D. (1960). The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pavan, B. (1986). "A Thank You and Some Questions for Madeline Hunter." Educational Leadership, 43(6).

Robbins, P. and Wolfe, P. (1987). "Reflections on a Hunter-Based Staff Development Project." Educational Leadership, 44(5).

Schoppmeyer, M. and Coppola, A. (1987). Evaluating Educational Personnel. Iowa: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Company.

Sergiovanni, T. (1987). The Principalship. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R. (1979). Supervision: Human Perspectives. 2nd edition, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sheehan, A. (1989). "Attitudes of Building Principals Towards the Program for Effective Teaching in South Carolina." An unpublished doctoral dissertation, South Carolina State University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 51-10A.

Slavin, R. (1987). "The Hunterization of America's Schools." Instructor, 8(156).

Slavin, R. (1989). "PET and the Pendulum" Faddism in Education and How to Stop It." Phi Delta Kappan, 70(10).

Stallings, J. (1985). "A Study of Implementation of Madeline Hunter's Model and Its Effect on Students." Journal of Educational Research, 78.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ARKANSAS SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL

P.O. Box 428, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701
(501) 575-5109

January 11, 1993

Dear Teacher Center Coordinator,

The Arkansas School Study Council (ASSC) is conducting a comprehensive research study concerning the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) staff development program (Hunter Model). As most would probably agree, the PET program has made a strong impact on teachers and administrators in Arkansas. The primary thrust of the research study will be a comprehenstve attitude/opinion survey of the PET program sent to every building principal in the state of Arkansas.

The ASSC is interested in the training aspects of the PET Model completed by each Educational Service Cooperative. **All information provided will be confidential and will be used for informational purposes only.** No Educational Cooperative will be identified by name in the research study. The results from the research study will be published in the ASSC Newsletter at a later date, and a copy will be sent to each Educational Cooperative.

Would you please be kind enough to complete the questions below as accurately as possible and return this survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope no later than **Wednesday, January 20, 1993.**

Thank you very much for your cooperation on this research study.

Sincerely,

Arkansas School Study Council

PLEASE ANSWER EACH QUESTION AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE.

1. What year did your Educational Service Cooperative come into existence?_____

2. How many school disticts does your Educational Service Cooperative serve?_____

3. What year did your Educational Service Cooperative begin teaching the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) Model?_____

4. What is the total number of teachers your Educational Service Cooperative has PET trained since the existence of your cooperative?_____

5. What is the total number of building principals your Educational Service Cooperative has PET trained since the existence of your coopertive?_____

6. How many days do you include in a PET training cycle?_____

7. How many clock hours do you include in each days training session?_____

8. How many school districts use your Educational Service Cooperative to acquire their PET training?_____

9. Do you use Educational Service Cooperative personnel to teach your PET Cycles? Yes No

10. Do you employ outside consultants to teach your PET Cycles? Yes No

11. What daily fee to you pay outside consultants to teach PET Cycles?_____

12. How many times during the school year do you offer PET training?_____

a

APPENDIX B

ARKANSAS SCHOOL STUDY COUNCIL

P.O. Box 428, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701
(501) 575-5109

January 11, 1993

Dear Principal,

The ASSC is conducting a comprehensive research study. The study includes a survey concerning the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) (Hunter Model) in Arkansas. Since PET was first implemented in 1979 there have been diverse opinions concerning its implementation, effectiveness, and the content of the model. As we would all agree, the key element to the success of any staff development program is the attitude of the building principal. Therefore, we are asking you, the building principal, to take a few minutes of your time to complete the enclosed survey. The survey is called the **Program for Effective Teaching: Principal Attitude Survey** and has been sent to each school principal in the state of Arkansas.

All information will be confidential and we request you return the survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope no later than **Wednesday, January 20, 1993.** The survey was field tested and the estimated amount of time to complete the forty-five question survey is fifteen minutes.

The survey is divided into three parts. **Part 1** pertains to the evaluation of the overall aspects of the PET program. **Part 2** contains the essential components of the PET Model broken down and requires a values rating on each one. **Part 3** is pertinent subject data that will enhance our survey as we run studies on the breakdown of gender, race, age and experience. In addition, since numerous Educational Service Cooperatives conduct PET staff development training we are very interested in the feedback on the effectiveness of each cooperative. This will give us information on each regional area educational cooperative.

In closing, we would solicit any additional comments you have concerning the survey study or the PET Model. Write your comments at the bottom of the survey and attach additional sheets if necessary. The results from the survey study will be published at a later date in the ASSC newsletter. **Returning the survey indicates your informed consent allowing the confidential information to be used in the research study.** Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Arkansas School Study Council

- If your building or district **does not** use PET please indicate by checking and circle either building or district. If you **have not** completed a PET cycle please check below and return.

_____ My building /district **does not** use PET.
(circle one)

_____ I **have not** completed a PET Cycle.

a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 118

APPENDIX C

PROGRAM FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING
PRINCIPAL ATTITUDE SURVEY

Information you provide is **confidential** and will be reported only as data for statistical analysis in a descriptive study.

DIRECTIONS FOR SURVEY QUESTIONS

Please read each item carefully. Circle the response which **most clearly** represents your attitude and/or opinion.

Use the following scale:
1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Agree 4 = Strongly Agree

PART 1: Evaluation of PET Program	**SD**	**D**	**A**	**SA**
1. PET training should be **required** for every teacher.	1	2	3	4
2. PET training has **improved** how others in education perceive me.	1	2	3	4
3. PET has **improved** my skills in observing and coaching teachers.	1	2	3	4
4. PET training is a **waste** of time.	1	2	3	4
5. PET training has **improved** administrator morale.	1	2	3	4
6. PET training should be **required** for every Arkansas principal.	1	2	3	4
7. PET trainers who trained me **presented** the training well.	1	2	3	4
8. PET trainers **modeled or secured someone to model** the conferencing techniques they wanted me to learn.	1	2	3	4
9. PET training has made me **more competent** in instructional supervision.	1	2	3	4
10. PET training **did not** teach me new information and/or skills.	1	2	3	4
11. PET coaching techniques **are not** effective with my teachers.	1	2	3	4
12. PET training **requires** too much time for the benefits gained.	1	2	3	4
13. PET training has resulted in **higher** achievement test scores (MPT, MAT6, Stanford 8) for my students.	1	2	3	4
14. PET training mini-review workshops should be **required** for all faculty each year.	1	2	3	4
15. PET coaching **is beneficial** to all teachers.	1	2	3	4
16. I am **pleased** with supervision skills acquired from PET.	1	2	3	4
17. PET maintenance plans **should be** implemented in all schools.	1	2	3	4
18. Additional PET training would be **beneficial** to me as an instructional leader.	1	2	3	4
19. PET maintenance **is being implemented** in my school.	1	2	3	4
20. My teachers **regularly** use PET during instruction.	1	2	3	4
21. I conduct PET conferences **within 3 days** after an observation.	1	2	3	4
22. PET **has improved** my teachers' morale.	1	2	3	4
23. PET is an **effective tool** for evaluating certified personnel as required by Arkansas law.	1	2	3	4
24. My teachers have a **positive attitude** about PET training and implementation.	1	2	3	4
25. PET is **the best** staff development program I ever attended.	1	2	3	4
26. The PET Program **is controversial** with my teachers.	1	2	3	4
27. The PET Program **is controversial** with Arkansas principals.	1	2	3	4
28. Our teacher evaluation instrument **is based on** PET terminology.	1	2	3	4
29. The Educational Service Cooperative serving my school district does an **effective** job with PET training.	1	2	3	4

over>

PART 2: PET Components
Rate the following components of the PET Model in relation to its value to the classroom.

(0 = No Value To Teachers) to (4 = Very Valuable To Teachers)

30. **Total Teaching Act**	No				Very
a. Knowledge of Content	0	1	2	3	4
b. Planning Skills	0	1	2	3	4
c. Selecting Appropriate Materials & Using Them Appropriately	0	1	2	3	4
d. Classroom Management	0	1	2	3	4
e. Human Relations	0	1	2	3	4
f. Instructional Skills	0	1	2	3	4
g. Knowledge of Human Growth and Development	0	1	2	3	4
31. **Instructional Skills**					
a. Selecting The Objective At The Correct Level Of Difficulty	0	1	2	3	4
b. Teaching To The Objective	0	1	2	3	4
c. Maintaining The Learner's Focus On The Learning	0	1	2	3	4
d. Monitoring And Adjusting	0	1	2	3	4
e. Using, Without Abuse, Principles Of Learning	0	1	2	3	4
32. **PET Training**					
a. Lecture/Theory On Content Of PET Model	0	1	2	3	4
b. Demonstration Lessons For Analysis In PET Class	0	1	2	3	4
c. "Practice" Lessons (With Observer) During Training	0	1	2	3	4
d. "Coaching" By Principal After Teacher Concludes Training	0	1	2	3	4

33. PET training is **mandatory** for our teachers: (1) Yes___ (2) No___

34. Total number of faculty/staff in your building **currently** PET trained: ____ out of ____

35. My school district is a member of the ≤ Educational Service Cooperative.
(Check appropriate number)

___(1) Arch Ford	___(6) Great Rivers	___(11) South Central
___(2) Arkansas River	___(7) Northcentral Ark.	___(12) Southeast Ark.
___(3) Crowley's Ridge	___(8) Northeast Ark.	___(13) Southwest Ark.
___(4) Dawson	___(9) Northwest Ark.	___(14) Western Ark.
___(5) DeQueen	___(10) Ozarks Unlimited	___(15) Wilbur Mills

36. Number of PET Training Cycles Completed By You: 0___ 1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5___

37. PET Training conducted by (1) School District___ (2) Ed. Srv. Coop.___ (3) Other___

PART 3: SUBJECT DATA (Please check the appropriate response as it relates to you)

38. SEX: (1) Male___ (2) Female___

39. RACE: (1) Caucasian___ (2) African-American___ (3) Hispanic___ (4) Other___

40. AGE CATEGORY: (1) 20-25___ (2) 26-30___ (3) 31-35___ (4) 36-40___
(5) 41-45___ (6) 46-50___ (7) 51-55___ (8) 56+___

41. TOTAL YEARS IN EDUCATION (1) 1-5___ (2) 6-10___ (3) 11-15___ (4) 16-20___
(5) 21-25___ (6) 26-30___ (7) 31-35___ (8) 36+___

42. EDUCATION: (1) Bachelors___ (2) Masters___ (3) Specialist___ (4) Doctorate___

43. SCHOOL TYPE: (1) Elem___ (2) Middle___ (3) Jr.___ (4) High___ (5) Vocational___

44. BUILDING GRADE LEVELS SERVED _____ thru _____

45. CURRENT BUILDING ENROLLMENT_____

COMMENTS:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

★ Aiken County ★
Public Schools

Aiken County Public Schools

843 Edgefield Avenue, N.W. • P.O. Box 1137 • Aiken, South Carolina 29802-1137

Dr. Joseph R. Brooks, Superintendent
(803) 641-2700

February 1, 1993

Paul M. Terry
P. O. Box 4424
Fayetteville, AR 72702-4424

Dear Paul:

It is with great pleasure that I grant you permission to replicate the study I conducted in 1988-89 entitled *Attitudes of Building Principals in South Carolina Toward the Program for Effective Teaching.* The survey you sent to me seems very appropriate for your study of principals in Arkansas.

You have my permission to use Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 5 and to replicate the tables and breakdowns on gender, race, elementary, middle, secondary, quality of training subscale, enhance subscale, coach subscale, and behavior subscale. I agree that Hypothesis 4: PET Training Schedule would not be applicable to your study.

I wish you every success as you undertake this study of The Program for Effective Teaching in Arkansas. Please keep me informed as to your progress.

Sincerely,

Alice S. Sheehan

Alice S. Sheehan, Ed.D.
PET Trainer/Inservice Coordinator

AS:md

BOARD OF EDUCATION: Mr. Glover M. Hickson, III (Chairman), Mr. Johnny A. Shaw (Vice Chairman), Mrs. Kay P. Chriswell, Mr. James A. Moore, Mrs. Sheran B. Proctor, Mr. Charles E. Reames, Sr., Mr. Robert H. (Bob) Slay, Mr. James L. Verenes, Mrs. Inease P. Williamson